DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 375 772 HE 027 871

AUTHOR	Swoboda, Marian J., Ed.; Roberts, Audrey J., Ed.
TITLE	Women Emerge in the Seventies. University Women: A Series of Essays, Volume III.
INSTITUTION	Wisconsin Univ., Madison.
PUB DATE	80
NOTE	153p.; For other volumes in the series, see HE 027 869-872. Funding provided by the Elizabeth Conrad Fund.
AVAILABLE FROM	University of Wisconsin, Office of Equal Opportunity Compliance, Post Office Box 8010, Madison, WI 53708-8010 ($3.50).
PUB TYPE	Books (010) -- Collected Works - General (020) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Athletics; College Curriculum; *Educational History; Females; *Feminism; Higher Education; Life Style; *Political Socialization; Public Colleges; Reentry Students; Sex Bias; *Sex Discrimination; Sexism in Language; Social History; *Women Faculty; Womens Education; Womens Studies
IDENTIFIERS	*1970s; *University of Wisconsin; Wisconsin

ABSTRACT

This monograph reviews the role of women in the development of public higher education at the University of Wisconsin with special focus on the period of the 1970s. Essays are presented in the categories of the politicization of women, curriculum, language, athletics, lifestyle, and the re-entry woman. Essays include: "The Women's Movement and the University" (Bonnie Cook Freeman); "History of the Association of Faculty Women at Madison" (Ruth Bleier); "A History of the Wisconsin Coordinating Council of Women in Higher Education" (Jacqueline Macaulay); "Committee on the Status of Women at Milwaukee" (Jane Crisler); "Graduate Women Assess the Campus: A Case in Point about Sexism" (Jane Van Dyk); "A Women's Studies Plan for Wisconsin" (Karen Merritt); "The Women's Studies Program--Milwaukee" (Rachel I. Skalitzky); "Sedition in a Sexist Society: The Platteville Paradigm" (Barbara Parsons); "Chair, Chairman, Chairperson" (Carolyn Sylvander); "Women's Athletics at Madison and Title IX" (Kit Saunders); "Merging Two Careers and Marriage" (Agate Krouse and Harry Krouse); "We Have Hired Couples for Years" (Nancy Newell Moore); "The President's Wife: A Changing Role--Observations of a Chancellor's Wife" (Judith T. Guskin); "Child Care and the University" (Irene Kiefer); "Continuing Education: A Personal View" (Kathryn F. Clarenbach); "An E.B. Fred Fellow" (Fannie Hicklin); "Continuing Education Services in the UW System" (Peg Geisler); "Meeting the Needs of Re-entering Students: Developing a Course at Stevens Point" (Isabelle Stelmahoske); "A Remarkable Woman: Grace Pilgrim Bloom (1886-1978)" (JoAnn Hinz); "From Undergraduate to Judge at Sixty" (Betty D. Brown). Some essays contain references. (JDD)

Volume III
University Women
A Series of Essays
University of Wisconsin System

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Marian J. Swoboda
University of Wisconsin System
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED 375 772

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

WOMEN EMERGE IN THE SEVENTIES

HE027871

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

UNIVERSITY WOMEN
A Series of Essays
Volume III

Editors: Marian J. Swoboda, Ph.D.
Audrey J. Roberts, Ph.D.

Cover Design: Patricia J. Clark, M.F.A.

Introduction: M. Susan Beck, Ph.D.

Funding: Elizabeth Conrad Fund

©1980 Board of Regents
University of Wisconsin System

Published by the Office of Women
1802 Van Hise Hall
1220 Linden Drive
Madison, WI 53706

Price: $3.50

PREFACE

The emergence of women as a vocal and visible political force in the 1970's, the rise in academia of special programs in the study of women, and a raised social consciousness to the inequities women face in higher education have all been contributing factors in an historical reassessment of the role of women in the development of American educational institutions.

This series of three monographs attempts to reassess the role of women in the development of public higher education in Wisconsin. The monographs —

Volume 1: *They Came to Learn, They Came to Teach, They Came to Stay*
Volume 2: *Wisconsin Women, Graduate School, and the Professions*
Volume 3: *Women Emerge in the Seventies*

— are not conventional history, but anthologies of essays, impressions, and sketches dealing with the far and immediate pasts. The essays provide a female perspective on Wisconsin public higher education from the post Civil War days to today. One notices in reading the pieces a perpetuation of concerns: academic rank and promotion differences between men and women, salary inequities, marginal participation in university governance and administration, conflicts between social and career roles. One notes, as well, the varying responses to an on-going situation, responses that vary from acceptance to outrage.

The setting for these essays is the University of Wisconsin System, a federation of public higher education institutions in the State of Wisconsin. The System was formed in 1971 by legislative action merging the University of Wisconsin and the Wisconsin State Universities.

The former University of Wisconsin included the historical land-grant university at Madison, founded in 1849; the urban university at Milwaukee formed in 1956 through the merger of the former Wisconsin State College in Milwaukee and the University of Wisconsin Extension Center in Milwaukee; and two new universities created at Parkside and Green Bay in 1969.

The former Wisconsin State Universities consisted of nine universities which grew out of state normal schools established in Wisconsin between 1866 and 1916. They subsequently moved to state teacher college status then to state colleges and eventually became state universities.

The end result of this evolution of public higher education in Wisconsin is a System of 13 universities and 14 two-year centers plus the renowned extension service founded in 1891. As these three monographs demonstrate, women have played an influential part in the development of higher education in Wisconsin. Until now women's participation has been expressed primarily as footnotes to history. These essays begin to redress this inequity.

Contents

INTRODUCTION

PART ONE:

The Politicization of Women

Chapter 1: The Women's Movement and the University .... page 1
by Bonnie Cook Freeman

Chapter 2: History of the Association of Faculty Women at Madison .... page 11
by Ruth Bleier

Chapter 3: A History of the Wisconsin Coordinating Council of Women in Higher Education .... page 23
by Jacqueline Macaulay

Chapter 4: Committee on the Status of Women at Milwaukee ... page 35
by Jane Crisler

Chapter 5: Graduate Women Assess the Campus .... page 39
by Jane Van Dyke

PART TWO

The New Concerns

THE NEW CURRICULUM

Chapter 6: A Women's Studies Plan for Wisconsin .... page 53
by Karen Merritt

Chapter 7: The Women's Studies Program at Milwaukee .... page 59
by Rachel I. Skalitzky

THE NEW LANGUAGE

Chapter 8: Sedition in a Sexist Society: The Platteville Paradigm .... page 63
by Barbara Parsons

Chapter 9: Chair, Chairman, Chairperson .... page 75
by Carolyn Sylvander

THE NEW ATHLETICS

Chapter 10: Women's Athletics at Madison and Title IX .... page 81
by Kit Saunders

THE NEW LIFESTYLE

Chapter 11: Merging Two Careers and Marriage .... page 93
by Agate and Harry Krouse

Chapter 12: We Have Hired Couples for Years................ page 97
by Nancy Newell Moore

Chapter 13: The President's Wife: A Changing Role — Observations of a Chancellor's Wife .... page 107
by Judith T. Guskin

Chapter 14: Child Care and the University .... page 113
by Irene Kiefer

THE NEW CONSTITUENCY: THE RE-ENTRY WOMAN

Chapter 15: Continuing Education: A Personal View .... page 121
by Kathryn F. Clarenbach

Chapter 16: An E. B. Fred Fellow .... page 131
by Fannie Hicklin

Chapter 17: Continuing Education Services in the UW System .. page 133
by Peg Geisler

Chapter 18: Meeting the Needs of Re-entering Students .... page 141
by Isabelle Stelmahoske

Chapter 19: Two Cases in Point

A Remarkable Woman: Grace Pilgrim Bloom ...... page 149
by JoAnn Hinz

From Undergraduate to Judge at Sixty .... page 151
by Betty D. Brown

INTRODUCTION

American women have participated in at least two revolutions in the twentieth century. Revolution is a word not used lightly here; by revolution is meant something other than the "revolutionary" new ingredient in dish powder, or in the "revolution" no-iron cotton shirts. By revolution is meant a shift in paradigm that makes a difference to the wider culture.

To explain, a real revolution causes the people in a culture to reassess what they have assumed to be real and true and unchallengeable; a real revolution causes a paradigm shift, i.e., it proposes and insists upon a new way of looking at a formerly assumed reality. A culture, for instance, can be said to have undergone a paradigm shift, or intellectual revolution, when it moves from the assumptions of Newtonian physics with its fixed laws to Einsteinian physics with its relativity; when it moves from assumptions about the rights of power to a concern with the responsibilities of power; when it moves from a tradition of homogeneous egalitarianism to the celebration of heterogeneity and individualism.

Two such paradigm shifts — or revolutions — have occurred in the lives of American women in this century...but those revolutions have not come about without backlash, counterargument, or fierce attempts to maintain the pre-revolution sense of what is real and true about women's lives. The counter-revolutionary position in American political history is often Gothic or bizarre. There has been a tendency to link social, political, and economic change with sexual change...and when political change *requires* a change in sexual attitude, real resistance appears. As Barbara Parsons quotes from William James' *Pragmatism*:

> *by far the most usual way of handling phenomena so novel that they would make for a serious rearrangement of our presumption is to ignore them altogether, or to abuse those who bear witness for them.*

Let us consider.

The women's movement or the women's revolution is far from new, even to this century, with which this essay deals. Moreover, the women's political movement has always been tied to its Gothic pair, the sexual movement, however understood.

The early quarter of this century saw a political revolution which was led, most famously, by Carrie Chapman Catt. It gained the vote for American women and some political structures to help support the newly enfranchised women who had been sentimentalized and closeted from matters of the world during the Victorian nineteenth century (see Ann Douglas' *The Feminization of American Culture*). Eleanor Roosevelt became a personal symbol of the political movement; the League of Women Voters became its organizational symbol.

Public policy, however, is also related to private manner. After the early-in-the-century publication of Sigmund Freud's *Interpretation of Dreams* (1900), women "learned" that they were not only un-enfranchised citizens, but penile-envying non-men. The acknowledgment of the peculiarly feminine perception of the universe tended to lead women in two directions. One direction was intellectual, academic, and socially conscious, and the women in this movement sought to express a peculiarly female point of view in art (Virginia Woolfe, Gertrude Stein, Georgia O'Keefe), in philosophy (Suzanne Langer), and in the social sciences (Margaret Mead and Jane Addams).

More important to the public mind, however, was the early twentieth century woman who was given the vote, given artistic and social freedoms, but who turned "sexually peculiar" — and became the flapper who bobbed her hair, smoked cigarettes, drank bootleg liquor, shortened her skirts, and declared her sexual libertarianism. The flapper became an "I told you so" example for those who would maintain the assumed purity of the assumed pristine past.

Then, a silence fell upon the situation of women in American culture. What happened to the original revolution which gave us models of women as informed political persons, as adventurous selves, as sexual seekers, as scholars, intellects, and artists? What happened to the original revolution that sent young women — just a decade ago — to the streets where they burned their bras, appeared on talk shows in Superman outfits, declared the joys of lesbianism, created the term "male chauvinist pig," and generally altered the language by the insistence that all reference to gender be removed from English?

A guess that two things happened is in order — and again because of political and sexual reasons. After the initial revolution came two world wars, wars that put men in uniform and women in factories. Female employment was hardly a "liberation," for it was an economic necessity. But that employment did acquaint women with skills, with an independent income, with a sense of being culturally rewarded for doing something important.

Economically — or so the argument goes — the country could not afford women in the work force at the end of the second world war and there began a national advertising campaign to put women back in the home. The late 1940s and early 1950s saw the dawn of what could well be called "McCallism," for McCall's magazine led the field in phrase-making for the insisted upon paradigm. You have surely heard many of the phrases: the family that prays together stays together, the family that plays together stays together. McCall's, however, was not alone. The mass media created one big ad for the value of the traditional American home, although whether or not there had ever been one is open to question. The enforced paradigm consisted of dad at the office, big brother helping baby Sally, mom neat as a pin making cookies. The "Father Knows Best" television program and the Dick and Jane books that some of you remember are but two examples of the cultural mythology.

Thus, by the middle fifties, many women were middle class and homebound and justified by the media for being so. But these women had children, and many of them were women, and they got upset in the sixties with a plastic society, that society's racism, and an unpopular war. They joined movements — first, the civil rights movement and then the anti-war movement which, though both political in inception, had a great deal to do with the liberation movement in our midst.

Again, the American women's insistence upon political, social, and economic change faced a counter-argument that was sexual in nature; the American Gothic rode again. Any insistence that the balance of power — between the propertied and the propertyless, between black and white, between man and woman — be shifted or equalized has given rise to fears, generally sexual, about what that shift or change might mean.

Although the civil rights movement, with its painful and frightening beginnings at Woolworth lunch counters in the spring of 1960, did finally result in legislative action with Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, the successes were not without Gothic incident. Black men were lynched, black church school children were bombed, white nuns were reportedly sleeping with white priests — or, worse yet, with young black men.

When the civil rights activists became the anti-Vietnam war activists, women were there. But, to repeat the oft-quoted remark of Gloria Steinem, women finally realized that the male activists were making the speeches while the women were making the coffee.

Thus, women politicized on their own behalf. Although the women's movement gained the 1972 Education Amendments, women's successes were met, again, with Gothic counter-attack. The ERA has been blocked again and again with arguments about "unisex" toilets (didn't we all grow up with one?).

The 1970s can well be considered the decade in which American women re-emerged as political forces and not mere "influences." Yet, there is no single thing called feminism; its voices vary and include the angry, the articulate, the unfortunate, the ideological, the literary, the artistic, and the thoughtless. Some of these voices are anthologized here and characterize the changing academic scene of the seventies.

1977 Ol' Girls' Club, UW-Milwaukee
Front, l-r: J. Dunleavy, J. Crisler, L. Harmon, C. Shammas. Back, l-r: M. Conway, C. Ridgeway, M. Moon, E. Sloane, M. Swoboda, R. Skalitzky.

PART ONE

THE POLITICIZATION OF WOMEN

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1. The Women's Movement and the University

by Bonnie Cook Freeman

Before the 1970s, there was no widespread recognition among University of Wisconsin women about their inferior status as a group. As at other universities, the number of faculty women was relatively small and they were scattered. Consequently, they did not regularly have contact with each other.

During the 1970s several noteworthy women attempted to develop an awareness among UW academic women. It is coincidental, and of some consequence, that one of the original national founders of the National Organization for Women (NOW) and the first chair of the NOW steering committee, Dr. Kathryn Clarenbach, was also a member of the faculty in UW-Extension. Clarenbach had received a doctorate in political science from UW, and had represented UW at the National Conference of State Commissions on the Status of Women in June 1966 as the appointed head of the Wisconsin State Commission on the Status of Women. She was one of many women who left that convention and went back to their respective campuses with the commitment to begin organizing academic women.

That fall, Clarenbach, then director of women's university education in UW-Extension, called a meeting of several UW faculty women and university officials to explore the status of women on the UW campus. Her major concern was a report compiled by the university business office which showed that the average faculty male made $1,734 more per year than the average female.[1] Most of those who attended that meeting in 1966 were unwilling to admit the possibility that the salary differential might be due to sex discrimination rather than merit. The time was too early, and the attempts of Clarenbach to forge a new organization of faculty women failed. Not until after 1966 did more systematic and provocative information and ripened climate provide sufficient cause for UW faculty women to organize.

The women's movement in general began to be visible on campus in 1969.[2] It grew out of developments during the 1960s — the larger women's movement and changes in growth and structure of higher education institutions. By the fall of that year a number of small women's groups emerged. Their meetings were perceived by their members as largely nonpolitical sessions. The concerns of these groups included the personal, supportive discussions the movement refers to as consciousness raising, the causes and effects of sex role stereotypes, the need for child care centers, and the struggle for women's rights to control their own bodies. Although most women who were involved initially were students, some staff and faculty members also participated.

In the fall of the 1969-70 academic year, another group, more political and academic in its purpose, was organized to discuss problems for women at UW and to do research and gather data on women undergraduates, graduates, and faculty. This group, drawn largely from graduate students in the humanities, called itself the women's research group, and published in 1970 a widely circulated pamphlet entitled *Women at Wisconsin.*[3] The document described the experiences of academic women at UW who, among other things, found themselves encouraged to discontinue graduate education, or who were steered into stereotypically feminine disciplines, or had too few female role models on the faculty.

In the second semester of the 1969-70 academic year, the women in the Teaching Assistants Association (TAA — the official representative organization of teaching assistants in contract bargaining at UW) began to organize a separate women's caucus to focus on their particular status as female teaching assistants who were subject to different problems which were not easily recognized by the men in the TAA. This process apparently began when women were dispatched on recruitment drives to the "women's departments," where there appeared to be little support for unionization. One outcome of this effort was the discovery on the part of the TAA women that the union had failed, in large part, to recognize and deal with the real but different problems of women.[4]

In the summer of 1970, the Women's Equity Action League (WEAL), filed a charge of sex discrimination against the UW with the Department of Labor under Executive Order 11246 as amended by Executive Order 12375. It was rumored that the grounds for the Department of Health, Education and Welfare's (HEW) complaint against Wisconsin was the report *Women at Wisconsin*, and other evidence which demonstrated the gap between the academic rank held by men and women in various departments.[5] However, women faculty members were neither notified nor otherwise aware of the WEAL action.

The exclusion of women from the HEW investigation, and the excuse for so-doing being the absence of a faculty women's organization at UW with which to make contact, served as the sufficient catalyst to galvanize an organization of faculty women in the fall of 1970. Clarenbach convened a meeting of a small group of faculty women to discuss the HEW report and sex discrimination at UW on October 29, 1970. In addition to discussing the need for an HEW investigation, the women present also considered the need to establish a full-fledged organization with bylaws of governance, and a steering committee whose purpose was to organize meetings, set agendas, and make recommendations to the larger organizations.

On November 24, 1970, the Association of Faculty Women (AFW) was formally created. On this date, the members at the meeting approved the bylaws which were to serve as the organization's operating procedure, recommended by the steering committee of AFW. Incorporated into the bylaws were unexpected components of the new feminist theory — membership qualifications (open to all women who held academic positions at UW, including those in jobs classified as specialists and research associates), leadership by the election of co-chairs, and rule by consensus — in an attempt to modify what was perceived as conflict procedures institutionalized in men's organizations.[6]

After the bylaws had been agreed upon, the next organizational goal was to gain access to the July, 1970 HEW report on the status of women at UW, which the UW administration was withholding from public observation, and to pressure the HEW investigation team to return to UW for further examination of sex discrimination.[7] These initial acts became the events leading to a take-off point for the women's movement at UW.

During the years after 1970, the AFW served as a focal point where major issues of concern to women on campus could be articulated and positions developed and defined. As a result of the convening of these women, a mutually defined reality began to develop about their common problems as women. Faculty women at UW began to identify themselves as a group that had been ignored and consequently discriminated against, even if not with conscious intent. Faculty women began to meet on a regular basis. The continuing interaction and exchange among these women, previously isolated from each other, and the inclusion of women who were in specialist categories and non-tenure track positions, increased their knowledge of incidents of campus-wide sex discrimination. With a widening of the intellectual parameters of sexism, discussions among AFW members led to the identification of a whole host of other general women's issues at UW and in the larger context of American society, a perspective that faculty women in their individual roles as professors may have been blinded from without the organization.

Shortly after the founding of AFW, the president of the UW System, John Weaver, was sent a list of issues of concern to faculty women. In apparent response to the request, President Weaver delegated the chancellors of the various UW campuses to set up employee relations committees on their respective campuses to accommodate employee interest groups such as (but not exclusively) women's rights organizations.[9] Weaver also directed each campus unit head to review the status and salary of every woman academic staff member to determine their comparability with those of similar men, and that sex discriminatory inequalities be corrected.

In January of 1971, the chancellor of UW-Madison, Edwin Young, created an affirmative action post and appointed an associate professor to investigate the status of women on the UW-Madison campus. In November of 1971, the equity review conducted at the request of President Weaver found women not to be receiving pay commensurate with men holding similar positions and having similar qualifications. Accordingly, the women were entitled to retroactive equity raises. In response to pressure the university reallocated funds to correct average salary discrepancies. However, this effort was stalled by the State of Wisconsin. In response, the AFW in January of 1972, filed a complaint with HEW in order to force the retroactive equity pay raises.[10] It was not until July of 1972 that affected faculty women were issued checks which were to raise their salaries to equitable levels.

By the beginning of the academic year 1972-73, there was widespread recognition among women about discriminatory processes affecting them, particularly because of the publicity given to the issue of retroactive equity payments. The checks received in the mail made many women aware of how inequitably paid they had been. Thus, the years leading up to 1972-73 assisted many faculty women in redefining events (formerly considered personal failings) into a political framework in which women perceived themselves as a group systematically discriminated against.

As professional women, the UW faculty women did redefine individual problems as women's political issues. The evolution of the AFW and the whole network of groups which sprang up around the question of the status of women on the UW campus indicate the political learning on the part of women who had been largely amateurs at the rough and tumble of university politics. As they developed political sophistication, they also developed political strength. To initiate moves or to respond to discriminatory policies, they learned how the university functioned — how informal, tacit norms versus explicitly stated rules dominated university operations, how committees were stacked, how certain departments obtained special privileges, how target balloting was used, and how voting in blocs in university elections could obtain representation for particular interest groups.[11] As highly educated women, they were able to research and identify problems of concern to women on campus, to collect and analyze data, and to provide a coherent, convincing documentation of sexist practices at UW which served as the basis for the assertion of their claims. Although initially not taken seriously, by their unflagging perseverance, they did acquire more than a modicum of credibility.

While applying their new political knowledge, UW women were also assisted simultaneously by the larger context of the women's movement, legislation such as Title VII, and a set of other fortuitous and idiosyncratic circumstances. The national legislation and the national women's movement became the basis for creating expectations of reform among academic women. For one example, Executive Order 11375 amended Executive Order 11246 and prohibited discrimination by all federal contractors on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, and sex. Under this order, contractors of the federal government (including universities) who received funds from the federal treasury were required to practice non-discrimination in personnel matters and to take affirmative action to remedy the effects of past discrimination. In response to increasing pressure and publicity there were other major legislative developments in the area of education and its relationship to women.

In March of 1972 the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972 extended coverage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to women in educational institutions. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) was given the power to sue on their behalf. In April of 1972, EEOC issued new guidelines on sex discrimination, forbidding discrimination against women in the advertising of vacancies, in recruiting, in pre-employment inquiries, and in the distribution of fringe benefits. Finally, in June of 1972, Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 prohibited discrimination against female students in admission and services, and by implication, forbade employment discrimination. Furthermore, the act carried a rider amending the Equal Pay Act of 1963 to extend coverage to female professionals.

It was this legislation which UW women had both lobbied for and later used to press UW to respond to the spirit of the law and meet legislative and bureaucratic requirements. They directed attention to inadequate enforcement of laws against sex discrimination and university avoidance of compliance.[12] And also, they did not restrict themselves to the problems of UW professional faculty women alone; they joined with other women located in the university structure to identify problems of concern to all women on campus. It was perhaps unintentional, but the wisest move that could have been made in terms of strategic political analysis. For by so doing, faculty women active in AFW were able to build a broad powerful women's network in numbers, location, loyalty, and experience on the UW campus, which later was extended to all campuses across the state.

While many would contend (and rightly so in the context of UW) that the overall record of wringing concessions from the UW administration was mixed and at a very high personal price, some changes beneficial to women did occur at UW in spite of university resistance. It is not clear that all of them were direct results of lobbying efforts of UW faculty women, but their efforts plus pressures from officials in federal agencies, from insiders in the UW administration, as well as from others, have achieved some important goals.

It would appear that UW faculty women had achieved, at least superficially, a good number of the goals which they delineated. However, without denying the successes, some of the changes have been considered merely token, symbolic in intent, short run in commitment, and minimal in the amount of effort invested by the university to obtain meaningful policy changes.[14] All were achieved at an unnamed price for many faculty women.

The personal price for some was loss of employment at the time of promotion. Several of the most prominent and charismatic leaders were denied tenure. The impact of this action on others, fearing for their own careers, was noticeable. Some bargained and negotiated with university officials to use the favorable political climate for their personal and professional benefit; some withdrew from active participation in AFW; some made tradeoffs for certain policy priorities over others, such as a women's studies program versus continual conflicts over other issues considered unobtainable. Many argue that most gains in hiring have been at the assistant ranks and below, the levels without tenure and power. They believe that when pressure for affirmative action is off, women occupying these lower strata of the professoriate will be expendable and denied tenure. Those who spent time on child care were disappointed and of the opinion that the final facilities developed by the university lacked size, quality staff, and money. Those initially involved in establishing a program of women's studies were disappointed that the committee delegated to develop a program knew little about the subject and that the program finally approved was a hodge podge of courses without any theoretical foundations, or degree-granting powers. Some faculty women believed that the life of women's studies at Wisconsin will be shortlived and consider it an intellectually unsound program.

Since its early successes, the AFW has fragmented. Some of the most active members left the university, either because their contracts were terminated or by choice. Some were coopted by appointments to high level positions either in the UW administration or in the respective colleges in the university. Others were just exhausted. From that original strong AFW organizational base, only a skeletal social network remains. Those intellectually committed now lack their former political zeal. Furthermore, they did not realize how much energy still was required to maintain the achievements of the *status quo*. Thus faculty women have mixed reactions over what occurred during the years of the late sixties and early seventies.

One area of consensus is the effectiveness that AFW had at one point to bring about some changes in the face of incredible university resistance. In achieving some goals of affirmative action, UW was more successful than most universities. However, the outlook for continued external national support for aggressive affirmative action policies against sex discrimination is not optimistic in a country with a declining birth rate, a sluggish economy, and diminishing financial support for education at both the state and national levels of government. Most university officials are aware that the pressure from the federal government is off. Although more women have been hired, most of the increases have been at the levels of assistant professor or instructor. The current status differentials between men and women faculty will have serious consequences in the future. As faculty cutbacks are based on seniority, those hired last are most likely to be fired first. And, given the conservative political and budgetary climate of the late seventies in universities throughout the United States, it seems reasonable to predict continued losses in the area of female recruitment and hiring practices in higher education.

What implications are there for the future of women's liberation on the UW campus and in general? As an idea, and as a political force, what do the findings presented in this essay suggest? The discussion of this question will necessarily be speculative and interpretive, but it will be based, as much as possible, on the empirical data and the interpretations which have preceded it.

In 1964, Carl Degler made the argument that American women have traditionally shunned any feminist ideology.[15] He observed that women act as individuals, not as members of a group or sex-based caste. He pointed out that the most notable political organization of women (the League of Women Voters) is nonpartisan and avoids questions pertaining to women, lest it be labeled feminist and ideological.[16]

In the same year that Degler made these remarks about the non-ideological aspects of the earlier women's movement, David Riesman wrote the following about academic women:

> It would appear that women in general make no effort to create a counterculture, or "underground," to overcome their disadvantages, being in this respect as in others unlikely to unite as a "minority" for mutual protection and support. . . In fact, there is a fair amount of evidence that the women are their own worst enemies.[17]

With ten years of hindsight, it would appear that Degler and Riesman, neither altogether unsympathetic to the women's movement, poorly anticipated the events of the late sixties and early seventies. In the decade since their observations were published, events have suggested that the American soil is not always quite so thin or the climate quite so uncongenial as to prohibit the growth of a feminist ideology.

Contrary to the Degler and Riesman theories, academic women in the late 1960s and early 1970s did develop a viable organization out of which many discovered mutual problems and numerical strength, the two major factors assisting them in their effective lobbying efforts to influence members of the university administration toward adopting anti-sex discriminatory employment and educational policies. As some of the goals of the organization were obtained, however, women were satisfied with such policy changes as equity raises and did not (and could not) maintain the active momentum and energy levels required for continued social change. Academic women have many pressures on their time beyond spending it on broadly defined affirmative action goals, particularly if their political involvement in activities against their employer is bound to bring penalties.

While some were promoted, others were denied tenure and forced to leave UW. Those women appointed to high level positions in the university found themselves sometimes in unenviable positions. Their acceptance of such positions had made it difficult for them to attack the university administration employing them and their very appointments appeared to be an indication of the university's good faith to promote qualified women. Yet some of their most intimate, competent colleagues active in AFW were denied promotions. Holding the organization of AFW together in a continued spirit of challenge became near impossible. To maintain an active organization when some were rewarded, others punished, and yet others ignored, was difficult.

Those rewarded by the system have tended to forget the nature of the powerful organizational structure of the university administration and the types of power that could be, and were, used against them. There is a tendency to forget that an affirmative action officer exists only as long as an organized constituency supporting affirmative action continues to articulate public demands and standards for the university to meet. As the numbers and energies of this constituency decrease, the staff in the office of affirmative action will likewise eventually be reduced.

There is a tendency to forget the old maxim "easy come, easy go." Academic women, cross-pressured by family and professional demands, cannot maintain the active momentum of the movement to press continuously for social change (the burden being on those who wish change). While social strain along with other factors has been identified as a stimulant among other leading social movements, social strain can also be a source of a movement's demise. As the leaders are exhausted, fired, coopted, disillusioned and reassured, a new generation of leaders is needed to draw new recruits dedicated to achieving goals and expectations still unfulfilled. The pressure of isolated groups of women is insufficient.

Some of the shortcomings, naivete, and problems facing academic women in their attempts to maintain those policies for which they vigorously lobbied and those areas in which they continue to lobby for change have been discussed. While my analysis at times is critical, I do not mean to imply that I expect women to be "superior" to men (any more than blacks to whites) as human beings. In many respects, academic women are similar to academic men — in socialization processes to academic discipline, social backgrounds, belief in the meritocracy. They do differ, however, in the exchange rates required of them in becoming an academic — women are required to demonstrate greater commitments, sacrifices, and energies in their profession than their male peers. In spite of greater requirements, academic women do not appear very much different from academic men in the educational and political values they will endorse. The major exceptions are those issues where academic women can be a distinctive political force to end sex inequalities.[18]

Initially because of the fluid organization of the women's movement and disagreement in its ranks over goals, tactics and structure, men did not display their full capacity for repressing the movement. By the late 1970s the difficulties of reaction, lawsuits, and hindsight, indicate miscalculations and underestimation of male resistance to demands for sex equality. Academic men do not appear ready to give in to female demands quickly nor to voluntarily step down from their powerful, highly paid positions.

There is no reason to believe that the women's movement and its attempts to achieve its goals will proceed in linear fashion such that equity and justice are achieved. Historically, the political arousal of feminist groups has followed a cyclical pattern. Therefore, it may be wise to keep an eye on the successes and failures of this women's movement — even though we are fearful of the repetition of history. Many believe that the hard-fought struggle for women's suffrage reform was meaningless because it exhausted the energies of its members who were reassured after suffrage was acquired. And suffrage did not bring about the massive changes in the nature or definition of politics that some of its supporters had predicted.

As for the UW experience, it was not typical of academic women or university response. Few universities have had the large and militant group of academic women as were present at UW-Madison. And their advances, sometimes short-lived, bought at a price in time, energy, intellect, and emotional commitment, suggest the real difficulties inherent in significant eradication of sexism in higher education and society and even the stability of those meagre gains. However, the fact remains that the experience was real, the changes occurred; and I love Wisconsin because of the very special experience provided for me by the people there who made it an exciting intellectual place to be.

NOTES TO CHAPTER I

1. *Milwaukee Sentinel*, November 1966.
2. Elaine Reuben, "Women in the Multiversity," in Philip Altbach, et. al., *Academic Supermarkets*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, Inc., 1971, p. 212.
3. Women's Research Group, *Women at Wisconsin*, Madison, Wisconsin: 1970.
4. Reuben, *op. cit.*, p. 217.
5. Interview with Ruth Bleier, August, 1974.
6. See *Bylaws*. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin, Association of Faculty Women, mimeo.
7. Ruth Bleier, "Women and the Wisconsin Experience," paper delivered at annual meeting of the Women's Commission of Modern Language Association, December 1971.
8. A "Proposal from the Steering Committee of the Association of Faculty Women to the Administration of the University of Wisconsin for the Development of AN AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PROGRAM to Redress Past Inequities and to Establish a Policy of Equal Treatment and Equal Opportunity at the University of Wisconsin," Madison, Wisconsin: AFW, April 1972.
9. Bleier, "Women and the Wisconsin Experience," pp. 2-3.
10. Complaint of the Association of Faculty Women of the University of Wisconsin to the Department of HEW, Madison, Wisconsin: AFW Document, July 1972.
11. Joan Roberts, "Creating a Facade of Change: Informal Mechanisms Used to Impede Changing Status of Women," Madison, Wisconsin: Unpublished Manuscript, 1973.
12. B. C. Freeman, *A New Political Woman*, Madison, Wisconsin: Ph.D. Dissertation, 1975, Chapter 5.
13. Ibid.
14. Roberts, "Creating a Facade."
15. Carl Degler, "Revolution without Ideology: The Changing Place of Women in America," in *The Woman in America*, edited by Robert J. Lifton, Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1965, p. 215.
16. Ibid.
17. David Riesman, "Introduction" in *Academic Women* by Jessie Bernard, College Park, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1964, p. XVI.
18. B. C. Freeman, *A New Political Woman*, Chapter VIII.

I would like to acknowledge Joan Roberts and Philip G. Altbach for their sponsorship of this project.

2. History of the Association of Faculty Women — Madison

A Participant's View

by Ruth Bleier

In the summer of 1970 there was a flurry of quiet official activity on the University of Wisconsin-Madison campus regarding the status of its women without, however, our knowledge or participation. The main difference between that initial period and the subsequent several years was that the activity remained no longer quiet nor did it suffer from the absence of women participating in determining the course of their lives and work in the university.[1]

In July of 1970 a team from the Chicago Civil Rights Office of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) came to Madison to investigate charges of discrimination against women in employment policies and practices by the University of Wisconsin. The complaints were filed by the Women's Equity Action League (WEAL) and were based in part on a study prepared in the spring of 1970 by the Women's Research Group, a small group of women — students, faculty and faculty wives. Their study vividly described the attitudes and the practices that result in the channeling of women into certain kinds of professions and jobs, low paying and low ranking, along with their exclusion from others, not the least striking example of which is academia itself.

Despite the fact that those most concerned, the women themselves, were not interviewed in July, the HEW team confirmed the existence of a pattern of discrimination and underutilization of women as well as minority group members. Their report noted that the university had developed a written affirmative action compliance program in May of 1970 but that it was inadequate, lacking definite procedures for implementation of stated policies as well as projections of specific employment and promotion goals and target data for achieving them.

By the beginning of the fall semester word of these furtive happenings reached some of the women on the campus and in October Kay Clarenbach called a lunch meeting of all the women she knew to discuss the situation. The most significant discovery the fifty of us present made was that few of us knew each other and that few of us knew anything about how the university runs. Thus, in November we formed an Association of Faculty Women (AFW) and it soon included more than one hundred members at all ranks and from more than forty departments. Despite our name (chosen for convenience and out of some ignorance at that time about the numbers and significance of non-faculty academic ranks, especially for women) we have always been an organization counting among its most active members at least as many women with non-tenure track as with tenure track appointments.

In preparation for the January return of HEW, we (AFW) asked women to submit descriptions of discriminatory treatment. About twenty-two did and these proved of great value in identifying for ourselves and for HEW the nature of discriminatory practices and where they occurred. Our groundwork, though limited by time, proved to be a critical factor in directing the investigators to the vulnerable areas in a system which, we discovered, is bewilderingly vast, esoteric and obscure. It was also true that the civil rights director in Chicago was the *only* person assigned to HEW to investigate *all* the campuses in the entire nine state district, including Illinois, Wisconsin, Michigan, Minnesota and the surrounding five states. No report of his findings has ever, to our knowledge, been received.

In January, 1971, AFW elected its first officers and steering committee.[2] The University of Wisconsin had acquired a new president, John Weaver, and one of the first actions of the new AFW steering committee in January was to send him a letter noting the underutilization of women in faculty ranks as well as the discrepancies in the status of women as compared with men on the civil service staff. We asked that he provide for the establishment, on each university campus, of a committee on the status of women to be composed of faculty, civil service and student women who would be nominated by their constituencies, and we further proposed the establishment, on each campus, of an office for women to coordinate all matters relating to women. We asked him to direct his chancellors to increase markedly the number of women at all levels, to promote women now in posts not commensurate with their qualifications, to correct salary inequities, and to appoint women to faculty and administrative committees.

For these and all subsequent activities, such as meetings with the governor and President Weaver, we sought and received coverage in newspapers, on TV and radio, being convinced that in the long run, significant change will occur only when the entire university as well as its surrounding community are made constantly aware of the facts of inequality and also of the existence of an organized body of women intent on exposing and eliminating the inequities.

In response to our letters, President Weaver suggested new grievance procedures, and the establishment of a committee on the status of women (CSW) and directed each chancellor to review the status and salary of every woman academic staff member to determine the comparability with that of men and to correct inequalities. At the same time, Chancellor Young on the UW-Madison campus appointed Cyrena Pondrom as assistant to the chancellor in charge of affirmative action for women. The appointment was made without either Young or Pondrom consulting the AFW about selection procedures or possible candidates. Furthermore, the appointment was designated as half-time, a quite inadequate response to the need for an office for women with a full-time director, staff and adequate budget. Young also appointed a fourteen-member committee on the status of women. At the end of January a new administrative policy statement on nepotism was announced stating that no restrictions could be placed on hiring persons related through affinity or consanguinity.

In March 1971 the *Final Report on Status of Academic Women* appeared. It was a study undertaken by the UW System's office of planning and analysis at the request of the Faculty Council and covered women on all sixteen campuses of the university for the academic year 1969-70. It showed a pattern for the UW-Madison campus which is characteristic of universities across the nation:

157 women in tenure track appointments out of a faculty of 2,000 (7.8 percent) with *one-half* the women of the 157 in *exclusively* women's departments. Excluding the women in the predominantly women's departments, 2.5 percent of full professors were women, 5 percent of associate professors, 11 percent of assistant professors and the usual generous percentages of 35 percent instructors and more than 50 percent non-tenure track academic appointments. Average salary differentials between women and men of the same rank ranged up to $10,000.

A few changes were made over the following year: clearly identified equity adjustments were made in the salaries of 144 women. Some departments previously enjoying an exclusive male club atmosphere, such as history with sixty members, cautiously admitted one or two women. Some women about to be quietly fired because of tightening budgets suddenly became tenured as associate or full professors. One woman's salary leaped by $5,000.

In the ensuing years very few changes occurred that can be called affirmative action progress in the proportions of women hired or promoted. With ten percent of Ph.D.'s in chemistry and about nineteen percent in biochemistry going to women (and more than half of these from the top ten ranked departments), for example, no woman has been hired.[3]

We realized early on that if there were going to be an affirmative action program for this university, AFW would have to create it. So, in April of 1972 we presented the administration of the University of Wisconsin with "A Proposal from the Steering Committee of the Association of Faculty Women for the Development of AN AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PROGRAM to Redress Past Inequities and to Establish a Policy of Equal Treatment and Equal Opportunity at the University of Wisconsin for All Women".[4] This seventy-five-page document addressed itself to problems of concern to women students, faculty and academic staff, acknowledging that an equally urgent need also existed for the classified (civil service) staff, but required the participation of classified employees who at that time had no organization comparable to AFW. The program contained analyses and proposals concerning employment, hiring, promotion, non-tenure track academic positions, fringe benefits, grievance procedures, university governance, education and career development, counseling programs and services, women's studies, information resources, physical education and recreation facilities. It also suggested methods for implementing hiring and promotional goals and presented a data collection questionnaire for a computer program. Needless to say, our AAP was not adopted or used by the university nor were its makers consulted in the formulation of another.

We sent copies of our AAP to more than three hundred women and women's organizations on and off campuses throughout the country since we thought in any case it might be more valuable and certainly more welcome to them than to institutions. Also, during the first year of our existence, we organized ourselves into committees to investigate the problems, gather data, assess the needs in all areas of university life of special relevance to women. All of these findings provided the material for our AAP, as described above, as well as for other studies, reports, proposals and actions.

As a means of reaching, educating, and changing the thinking of those who make the real decisions concerning women — department chairs and their executive committees — our committee on employment and salaries prepared and sent out four thousand copies of a report analyzing the actual old boys' club methods of hiring, promotion and salary review within departments as well as the attitudes and assumptions concerning women which underlie and serve to justify the practices.[5] The report offered proposals for change and invited departments to have discussion with women from AFW. Such meetings were held in about twelve departments and were successful in raising issues, discussing attitudes and to a degree initiating changes.

The first task that the counseling committee set itself was to gather data on the status of women, both as professionals and as clients, in the various mental health departments and services of the UW.[6] This included study of the male/female utilization rates in various university clinics, a follow-up survey of counselor trainees and clients of the counseling center, as well as a study of the salary, hiring and promotion policies within these departments.

The fruits of these activities were useful in helping the counseling committee draft the counseling section of the AFW affirmative action program. Then committee members worked collectively and independently to implement aspects of the AAP. This included the development of a counseling program for women returning to school, discussions about sexism with students and staff in counseling and psychiatry departments, and a program for the Wisconsin Psychological Association meeting in May, 1973. Issues concerning women and psychotherapy have been incorporated into the psychiatric curriculum in the medical school.[7]

AFW members most interested in women's studies started courses and began meeting regularly with students and other faculty to begin together to assess resources, define needs, and explore approaches to the establishment of a program.[8] After years of persistent and often agitated efforts, the work of this committee led to the establishment of a woman's studies program in 1975. Throughout AFW's existence, its librarian members have worked on increasing all library resources of women's studies and on establishing collections of women's publications.[9] In addition to pressing for an increased budget, our librarians urged that positions be created for women's studies bibliographers. Early in 1977 the position of UW System librarian-at-large for women's studies was created.

In examining grievance procedures, we found that they were either ill-defined, inaccessible or inadequate for everyone. We think it is probably generally true that nowhere does there exist adequate procedures for women with grievances, especially if they involve sex discrimination, since at every level of an appeal the woman, whether faculty, civil servant or student, must confront a power structure which is all male. It became necessary for us to think through and propose procedures that would guarantee accessibility to some grievance procedure. Nothing has come of the efforts during 1971-72 to establish proper grievance procedures for any group needing them. During those early years and since, I functioned informally as a woman's advocate, helping in preparation of complaints and accompanying women in confrontations with deans and other symbols of academic authority. We won some and lost some. Mostly we learned that, in such situations, a woman, almost by definition powerless, ought never to go alone. My unexpected appearance (we knew they often bring along a supporting male without clearing it first with us) disrupted many a scenario destined to be otherwise unrecorded except indelibly in the mind of the exploited woman.

Some AFW members worked from the beginning on the problem of the specialist category, with its total lack of guidelines (and often morality) regarding salary, tenure, job termination, fringe benefits, privileges. Their work led to official recognition by the administration that there was a problem and this difficult area has been under negotiation for the last several years.[10]

During the first year of the AFW existence, I met with women on campus who were attempting to organize their sister office workers, and learned something of the problems faced by civil service employees. The phony distinctions that are made between men and women within the faculty are even more pernicious in the civil service with far more devastating economic consequences. On the UW-Madison campus, for example, there were 1,520 people earning $6,000 or less in the civil service — 1,500 women and 20 men.[11] Women who run offices and administer grants are clerk-typists and secretaries, at the lowest salary ranks; men who do the same work are accountants, administrative assistants, directors, managers and coordinators with significantly higher salaries. Changes will not be made in a rigidly hierarchial civil service system without extreme pressure from faculty women as well as from civil service women themselves.

As the chair of the chancellor's committee on the status of women subcommittee on grievances, I participated in discussions in late spring of 1971 with women graduate students to learn of their experiences within the institution and their departments and to try to understand why some women graduate students leave before getting a Ph.D. We were told of the efforts to channel them into professions more "seemly" for women, actual exclusion from departments of their choice, the constant barrage of belittling and suggestive as well as outright antagonistic comments and attitudes, the general atmosphere of unwelcome and, finally, the sense of futility since even if they persevere, faculty positions will not be open to them. We learned also that in many departments women graduate students had formed caucuses — in medicine, law, sociology, and psychology — and gained from this association a source of mutual strength and encouragement. We in the AFW concluded that a campus-wide organization of graduate student women could do even more and we all had much to gain from each other in understanding and changing departmental methods. We provided the graduate students with the space and time, help and support to form an organization, which they did, and called it the Graduate Women's Caucus. They recruited, educated, investigated and documented the forms discrimination takes against graduate students. Their work had broad ramifications including a dramatic confrontation with the Board of Regents at their May, 1972 meeting in an effort to expose sexual exploitation of women graduate students;[12] a study on "Enrollment and Employment Patterns of UW Graduate Women";[13] and the appointment of a chancellor's committee on graduate equity in May of 1972.

The chancellor's committee, charged with the investigation of discrimination against women in graduate school, had only *one* woman graduate student appointed to it. Of the other six members, four were males and only one of the faculty women had been involved in the women's movement on campus.

After bitter confrontations, two women graduate students were finally added to the committee.[14]

In the fall of 1971 a conference was called by the AFW in October to bring together women from campuses across the state for the purpose of sharing experiences and information. We had little time to prepare and few real contacts on the other campuses, yet close to one hundred women from nineteen campuses attended and formed the Coordinating Council of Women in Higher Education (WCCWHE) for the State of Wisconsin, which met monthly for several years on different campuses throughout the state. The first important characteristic we noted about the initial and subsequent meetings was the remarkable atmosphere of mutual confidence and commitment that permitted free discussion and the making of important decisions by consensus. Second was the urgent stimulus the conference provided for the subsequent organization of women on each university campus.[15] Many faculty women, previously working in isolation and mainly with students, returned to their campuses with some new insights, visions, or inspirations and proceeded to call meetings attended by more than half the women on campus. Coming from all corners of the state, WCCWHE members have represented a political and social force that could not easily be ignored.

As part of our statewide network some of us became involved in the numerous conferences and workshops for women organized by students and faculty on campuses throughout the state while others spoke with women in meetings, in the dormitories, and at the Y's.

In January of 1972 State Attorney General Warren ruled unconstitutional the retroactive salary increases authorized by the Board of Regents as women's equity pay adjustments. The AFW filed a complaint in January with the Civil Rights Office of HEW and in July of 1972 we filed an *amicus curiae* brief to force payment of the salary raises.[16] This effort was successful.

Early in 1972, I organized a series of meetings with women medical and nursing students, faculty, office and hospital workers and academic staff. About fourteen of us, half AFW members, met regularly as the ad hoc committee on women in the health sciences, to exchange information and assess problems. These discussions resulted in a set of proposals to Acting Dean (medical school) Pitot and Hospital Superintendent Varnum recommending establishment of a commission on women in the health sciences, to be fully and proportionately representative of all women working and studying there.[17] The document discussed many issues including medical school admissions, sexism in the lecture halls, curricular reform, classified employees, and the absence of women in administration. The official responses strongly suggested that our document was written in a strange foreign tongue.[18] Subsequent negotiations were tedious and nonproductive until the arrival of a new vice-chancellor for health affairs, Robert Cooke, in mid-1973. He accepted the need for a commission on women and adopted our procedures for its selection — by nominations and self-nomination solicited for *all* interested and committed people in the health sciences center.[19] A subcommittee of ad hoc members assisted in the selection of the commission on women in the health sciences which was appointed in September, 1974 and was truly representative of women in all categories of work and study in the medical center. The commission was able to select its own chairs, as we had suggested, and it has been active ever since.[20]

Meanwhile, in the medical school lecture halls, sexist "wit" was rampant in its characteristic and peculiarly retarded form including *Playboy* centerfold slides in lectures. After one especially offensive ten minute pre-lecture monologue, which happened to be taped, eight outraged women students came to me for advice. As a result they wrote and sent a complaint, documented with transcript, to HEW in April 1973.[21] That precipitated HEW action with subsequent feeble apologies to the class and perhaps some sensitization of some faculty members, though the incident did not convince the dean's office that some general corrective policy or education was necessary.

Another spin-off from AFW members' activities was the equity action committee formed in the school of education late in 1972, and given an official advisory status by the dean in March of 1973.[22] Also, in the fall of 1972 AFW began publication of a monthly newsletter, edited by Denise Tabet, to keep members and others informed of women's activities.

In the winter of 1972-73 there was growing unrest among women on campus because of the outstanding inequities in funding and facilities for women's sports activities. The *Daily Cardinal* and other sources exposed some facts about the women's intercollegiate teams:

The women on all twelve intercollegiate teams shared the same twenty-five warm-up suits; each intercollegiate team had $100 *total* per year for all expenses: travel, food, uniforms, etc.; the women's hockey, basketball, volleyball, and badminton teams were assigned non-regulation practice courts; the women's swimming team had to use a non-regulation size pool without proper diving facilities (or the "men's" pool at 6:30 a.m.); the women's tennis team was assigned courts only at 5:30 p.m., thus missing the dorm dinners; the women's track and fencing teams had to practice after the men were finished at 5:30 p.m., again missing dorm dinners; the women's track team had no showers to use after practice or competition.[23]

Innumerable requests for remediation were made by the concerned women to Elroy Hirsch, the director of intercollegiate athletics, to the intramural athletics office and others — all with no response. So, first, women students liberated the swimming pool during the men's hours;[24] then some joggers liberated the all-male (and only) locker room showers in the track shell building.

AFW recognized this as an important problem and wanted to join the campaign. I joined our new athletic committee, gathered necessary data and sent a letter outlining the problems and making a set of demands to Elroy Hirsch.[25] His letter, a classic of non-response, made our next step clear — the filing in March, 1973, of a complaint, fully documented with figures on hours, space, facilities, and dollars, with HEW and EEOC, charging violations of Title IX and Executive Order 11246.[26]

The subsequent chain of events resulted in an increase of the women's intercollegiate budget from $21,000 to $118,000 in one year ($230,000 in 1976-77), the appointment of a director of women's intercollegiate athletics, Kit Saunders, and several large steps toward equalizing facilities, practice and other resources for women athletes.[27]

Throughout 1972 and 1973 AFW continued to press strongly for open hiring policies and practices including advertising vacancies and the establishment of a job clearinghouse for faculty, academic and classified employees. Largely as a result of our continued pressure, some academic administrative changes occurred beyond salary equity adjustments and overdue promotions: a clear statement that tenure-track appointments can be made for part-time faculty; a definition of the terms of lecturer appointments; a study of the specialist category and the establishment of a minimum permissible salary; the establishment of a non-faculty academic job clearinghouse. The latter, however, we considered to be totally inadequate in both concept and functioning.[28]

In September of 1973 an administrative issues committee was formed for communication and self-education on major issues in UW administration with a particular emphasis on curricular planning and women's studies and their relationship to the budget process.[29]

1974 saw a renewed effort by AFW to get the UW-Madison affirmative action office (AAO) to open its records and to pursue affirmative action goals with vigor. Because of no real progress in achieving affirmative action goals and the AAO's use of statistics to obscure this fact, we filed a complaint with HEW in April, 1974.

As a result we were invited by the university committee (the faculty's executive committee) to meet with them in July and to present our recommendations for an effective affirmative action program. One consequence of this consultation was the appointment of a faculty committee on nondiscrimination and affirmative action in faculty employment, chaired by Lorraine Meisner. In 1976 the faculty senate approved the recommendations of this committee: That funds be available beyond normal allocation to bring women or minority candidates to the campus for employment interviews; that deans withhold approval of any tenure-track appointment not accompanied by specific evidence of a search in which every reasonable effort was made to identify and interest qualified women or minority candidates; and that departments be given encouragement and resources to make positions at Wisconsin attractive to particularly well-qualified women or minority candidates.[30]

1974 saw intense activity in two other areas. Strong pressures from the coalition of students and faculty committed to women's studies finally led to the appointment of a chancellor's committee on women's studies. It was a major achievement of the coalition and AFW to have a committee appointed that included a majority of people familiar with the concept of women's studies and interested in the establishment of a program. Some AFW members were active as members of the chancellor's committee and in collaborating with it as well as becoming teachers in the program established in September, 1975.

A women's studies program can become the arena of academic politics where women have the freedom and the power to put into practice particular feminist principles. And indeed on this campus those involved in women's studies have worked to ensure full participation in decision and policy making by all students, instructors, and community persons committed to the women's studies program.

Another effort that began with AFW members and then assumed an independent course, was the creation of a group to represent UW-Madison's very sizable academic staff (e.g., all those who are neither tenure-track faculty nor civil service classified staff). This effort began with a meeting of six AFW women. From there it proceeded to consultation with the successful Milwaukee academic staff group, to discussions with the chancellor and then the assistant chancellor, to recruitment of a wider membership which represented all categories of academic staff — men as well as women — and finally to the formation of the Madison Academic Staff Association. This association has lobbied for the creation of sound and equitable personnel rules for academic staff, and has served as the voice of academic staff in administrative deliberations. Like the AFW, it has been highly successful so far, but still has much to accomplish.[31]

In April of 1975 we changed our name to AFW/University Community Women to reflect both the fact that our membership has always included non-faculty campus women and our concern that women without official university connections feel welcome in the group.

At the present time (winter of 1976-77) a small number of women carry on the work of AFW.[32] Some of those formerly active are devoting much time now to programs which evolved from AFW activity — women's studies, academic staff, and others — or to individual pursuits within the women's movement. Many other of the early activists did not receive tenured appointments and had to leave; others left by choice to take positions elsewhere; some are probably simply tired of the often fruitless and frustrating task of battling an institution that seems incapable of significant learning or change; still others, I fear, generalizing from some benefit they may have gained, think that things have basically changed for women.

The fact is, we knew from the beginning that neither civil rights legislation nor its enforcer, HEW, would bring about a new world for women. HEW is, after all, only a governmental institution which will move, as it did in 1970, only under serious political pressure exerted by women.[33] Governments and their institutions are never, except in new revolutionary regimes, by choice, agents for change. They are rather protectors and embodiments of the status quo. To be so is, in fact, their reason and purpose for existence. They can become agents for change only when forced to by a group with sufficient power. An executive order, no more than a Supreme Court decision, will have force only if made to do so by those affected by it.

My own opinion is that the most significant and basic change that has occurred on the campus has been in us, the women. When fifty of us first met, not only did we not know of the HEW investigation, we also did not know each other. Now we have a network reaching into all corners of the university.

At a deeper level, there is the sense of exhilaration that comes with the loss of isolation, with the finding of some roots and connectedness, with the ability finally to articulate and communicate doubts, needs, hopes. The simple step of women meeting together, however small or large the group, inevitably begins a process of change, both for the women meeting and for those who know they are meeting, as well as for the relationships between the two. Whatever the level of initial involvement, the experience for most of us has been like stepping on an endless escalator that goes up only — an ever-heightening sense of awareness, self identity, direction and strength.

Finally, this is for me the first movement, in my twenty odd years of movements, that I am convinced will win out. First, because it includes half of humanity. Second, because people who get a taste of freedom become insatiable. Third, our personal liberation necessitates criticism and change in a society already in disarray. Our movement at the deepest level challenges traditional structures and ways of being. There is no doubt that the changes we can envisage could effect a revolutionary reconstruction of society and its institutions. An end to personal oppression, acceptance of the right to self-determination, mutual respect — all this we want; we expect nothing less.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 2

1 Parts of this history are taken from my paper, "Women and the Wisconsin Experience", *College English*, 34: 100-106, originally presented at the annual meeting of the Modern Language Association, December 1971.

2 Co-chairs: Ruth Bleier, neurophysiology, and Joan Roberts, educational policy studies; Secretary: Kathryn Clarenbach, University Extension; Treasurer: Helen Nash, psychiatry; Steering Committee: Helen Crawford, medical library; Rena Gelman, University Extension; Judy Ladinsky, preventive medicine; Cyrena Pondrom, English; Elaine Reuben, English; Mary Ellen Roach, home economics; Dorothy Schultz, Memorial Library; Ann Seidman, Land Tenure Center and sociology.

3 The three chemistry departments have had a combined faculty of close to one hundred, of whom only one is a woman, and her appointment is half in the department of psychiatry. We wonder how it happens that women are sufficiently "qualified" and available to be trained in these departments as graduate students and postdoctoral fellows and to work as research associates (and at other non-tenure lower paying ranks) but somehow cannot make it into those tenure-track slots.

4 The members of the AFW ad hoc committee on the affirmative action program who wrote and compiled the AAP, with the collaboration of members of the steering committee, were Nancy Abraham, Gabriele Kass-Simon, and Marjorie Klein. The co-chairs of AFW at that time were Sheila Klatzky and Elizabeth Monts.

5 "The Status of Professional Women at the University of Wisconsin: Proposals for Change," April 20, 1971. The committee on employment and salaries, chaired by Ann Seidman, included Miriam Allman, Ingrid Camerini, Jeanette Harries, Gabriele Kass-Simon, Joyce Puletti, Alice Robbin, Susan Weiden.

6 Joy Rice, Marjorie Klein, Pat Wolleat, Louise Leonard, Lynn Verrill, and Arlene Davenport constituted the committee.

7 This effort was initiated by Majorie Klein and Lorna Benjamin.

8 Rena Gelman and Elaine Reuben in 1970 started, on a volunteer basis and in response to the need and demand, the first feminist course, "Alice in Academe," forerunner of women's studies introductory courses. Joan Roberts started a course, "Education and the Status of Women" in the fall of 1971. This course brought together thirty participating women faculty, many of whom were thus stimulated for the first time to attempt a feminist critique of their discipline. In the fall and spring of 1972 Rena Gelman taught a course on the images of women in literature in UW-Extension. Miriam Allman and Ingrid Camerini also participated in planning a women's studies program.

9 Miriam Allman, Dorothy Schultz, Dorothy Kanter and others.

10 Ruth Crawford, Ruth Schwebke and Joyce Becker formed the specialist committee. Its work was subsequently extended and taken up by a new organization, the Madison Academic Staff Association, with active leadership by several AFW members: Karen Carlson, Jacqueline Macaulay and Pat Meller.

11 Marian Swoboda, "A Profile of the Classified Work Force at the University of Wisconsin," December 1971, UW System, Office of Women, Madison.

12 Laurie Hutzler, Phyllis Karr and Pat Russian, as members of the Women's Coalition, which included the Graduate Women's Caucus, were finally ejected from the regent's meeting.

13 Jane Van Dyk and Caroline Dyer, January 1972.

14. The UW-Madison Women's Coalition interrupted the first meeting of the chancellor's committee to demand its resignation along with that of Assistant Chancellor Pondrom (Bruce Swain, *Capitol Times*, May 9, 1972). Swain quoted Bleier: "At this point in time, to appoint a committee with a majority of male faculty members and only one graduate student to examine attitudes and practices of male faculty toward women graduate students is an incredible violation of decency, let alone ordinary intelligence. . . . Women do not need the paternalistic expertise which has thus far excluded them from decisions concerning their own lives."

    Pondrom was quoted as saying: "I understand my job to be the use of the best judgment possible to attempt to achieve full equity for all women in the university — staff, students, and faculty."

    Also, see correspondence between AFW Sheila Klatzky and Elizabeth Monts and UW administrators Cyrena Pondrom and Edwin Young, May and June, 1972, AFW files, Ruth Bleier, Madison.

15. The two AFW co-chairs at the time, Roberts and Bleier, using the statewide contacts of Kay Clarenbach, assumed main responsibility for the early organization of the WCCWHE as well as meeting with and helping to organize women on the various state campuses which at that time had no existing groups. Roberts became, with Annette Harrison of UW-River Falls, first co-chair of WCCWHE. Bleier drafted, from her AFW experience, the first documents which became the "Proposal from the Coordinating Council of Women in Higher Education to the Regents, President and Chancellors of the University of Wisconsin," submitted to the university in February, 1972. Ultimately WCCWHE revised and adopted for systemwide use the AFW affirmative action program.

16. This effort was guided mainly by AFW co-chairs Sheila Klatzky and Elizabeth Monts.

17. "Proposals to Acting Dean Henry Pitot and Superintendent James Varnum from the ad hoc committee on women in the health sciences, July 21, 1972. This document was written and signed by: Miriam Allman, Joyce Becker, Ruth Bleier, Ruth Dickie, Helen Dickie, Helen Hift, Mabel Hokin, Joyce Klein, Karen Lindsay, Cynthia (Meyer) Miller, Pat O'Shea, Julie Reimann, Gabriele ZuRhein.

    Its introduction reads in part: "It is no secret that women in the United States do not in general enjoy the freedom of opportunity and self-determination that is a guaranteed right for all people. This is reflected in their virtual absence from most professions and in their low economic status in the work force as a whole.

    "It is clear that the status of women is a social problem involving biased attitudes, stereotyping, and traditions which protect a comfortable status quo. Our society requires of its women that they assume the full responsibility for bearing and rearing its children and at the same time enter its work force as its essential teachers, secretaries, maids and nurses. Yet society neither provides women with the supporting institutions to facilitate these dual roles nor allows them the choice, without extraordinary effort, to enter the professions that are, by decree but not by biology, male preserves."

    Of the signers, Joyce Becker, Ruth Dickie, Marjorie Klein, and Pat O'Shea became members of the first Commission on Women in the Health Sciences.

    Cynthia Miller, among the first of the activist feminist medical students, refused to be excluded from the "doctors'" lounge at St. Mary's Hospital when she was a student on the obstetrics service. This room, where male medical students could engage in the kind of professional interchange which is an important part of training on the job, was closed to women physicians and students who had no lounge of their own.

18. Henry Pitot and James Varnum to Bleier for the ad hoc committee on women in the health sciences.

19. Robert Cooke to all members of the Center for Health Sciences, May 1, 1974.

20. See Annual Reports, October, 1975 and October, 1976, Commission on Women in the Health Sciences to Vice-Chancellor of Health Sciences.

21. Complaint to Odessa Fellow, HEW Chicago from Concerned First Year Medical Students, April 3, 1973.

22. Its first co-chairs were Jane Ayer and Julia Brown.

23. *Daily Cardinal*, March 8, 1973.

24. *Daily Cardinal*, February 28, 1973.

25. Bleier to Hirsch, March 16, 1973; letter Hirsch to Bleier, March 23, 1973, AFW files, Bleier's office. The letter from Bleier to Hirsch quotes relevant sections from Title IX of the Education Amendments Act of 1972 and from Executive Order 11246 as amended by Executive Order 11375 and continues:

"Consequently we demand immediate and equal use of all facilities: tracks, fields, courts and pools, locker rooms and showers. This means that all facilities be available to women and women's teams at *times* that are no more inconvenient for them than for men, such as dinner time for the tennis courts and after 5:30 p.m. for the track team, the periods currently *allowed* women.

We demand adequate and equal (as needed) funding for all women's team sports including salaries for coaches with full time academic appointments and expenses for training and competition.

Anything less than this must be negotiated with us and other women in athletics and justified to our satisfaction. We do not want to hear again about inadequacy of facilities, space and time. If they are inadequate, we will share equally with men in the inadequacy. The burden is no longer ours to wait. We have waited too long. The moral and, now, the legal burden is yours."

The letter from Hirsch to Bleier was and remains irrelevant.

26. Complaint to HEW and EEOC, April 3, 1973. Also see AFW Newsletters, January, 1974 and Spring, 1974.

27. The brevity of the description of these events should not imply that their unfolding was easy and automatic. The first Committee on Women's Athletic Programs and Facilities appointed by the chancellor in April, 1973, did not include any women students engaged in intercollegiate athletics (the usual paternalism) nor did it include as a voting member Kit Saunders, the coordinator of women's intercollegiate athletics. We brought these omissions to the attention of the committee's chair (Bleier to Murray Fowler, May 2, 1973). Kit Saunders and two women student athletes were added as voting members. This committee was vigorous and effective in changing athletics for women on campus.

28. AFW Newsletter, September, 1973.

29. Organized by Karen Merritt and including several women working in UW central administration.

30. Minutes of Faculty Senate meeting September 13, 1976.

31. I thank Jackie Macaulay for help in this paragraph.

32. This history was not meant to be exhaustive and, consequently, the activity and devotion of a number of women who have served over the years as officers and on the AFW steering committees have not been mentioned. I should like to include them here:

(1) Members who were active in the first year or two included Edith Jones, Lorraine Meisner, Sara Sherkow, Harriet Shetler, Elaine Staley, and Elaine Walster. Victoria Meyer has been active from those early years to the present.

(2) We early discovered that we had a friend in the UW central administration, Marian Swoboda, who before the first HEW visits tried to sensitize the administrators to the requirements of affirmative action and later became Assistant to President Weaver with systemwide responsibility for affirmative action programs for women faculty and students.

(3) For the 1973-74 year, Elizabeth Monts was re-elected and joined by Jane Ayer as co-chair. Ruth Schwebke was treasurer. By September each had to resign, Monts to take a position as chair of a department in Arizona and Ayer to take a position in central administration. They were replaced by Donna Kubai and Ruth Bleier. Renata Bromberg became treasurer since Ruth Schwebke accepted a professorship at Southern Illinois.

(4) During the course of 1974 and 1975, the steering committee added some new active members: Ann Brody, Sara Hummel, Judy Leavitt, Melanie Lenard, Pat Meller, Yvonne Ozello, and Vivian Wood.

(5) Jackie Macaulay became chair for 1974-75.

(6) During 1975-76 a group coordinated by Pat Meller led the activities of AFW.

33. The following statement was first expressed at the MLA annual meeting, December, 1971. I believe it still holds true.

3. A History of the Wisconsin Coordinating Council of Women in Higher Education

The Boundaries for University Women Are the Boundaries of the State

by Jacqueline Macaulay

The rather long subtitle of this article echoes the motto of the University of Wisconsin: "The boundaries of the campus are the boundaries of the state." As with most mottoes, this ideal is not always matched by reality, but there has been a period in UW history when women from all universities worked together to turn the idealism into reality. Their goal was the achievement of full equality for women in all areas of the UW System. They worked for and represented students, faculty, and all other employees. As this history will show, they put great amounts of energy and time into this effort for several years, and they accomplished some things and failed to accomplish others before that energy ran low.[1] That last sentence doesn't give away the ending because the last chapter in this history of this group cannot yet be written. As this article is being readied for final editing, women's status in the UW System has suddenly become the focus of attention again, and the subject of this history may be coming back to life. My own bias will become clear as this history unfolds, but let me state it clearly from the start: I believe the UW System still very much needs groups like the Coordinating Council of Women in Higher Education.[2]

Founding the Coordinating Council

Perhaps the best introduction to this statewide group of women activists — the Wisconsin Coordinating Council of Women in Higher Education (WCCWHE) — is to be found in some paragraphs written by Edi Bjorklund, one of the women who poured very large amounts of time and energy into WCCWHE. In 1974, when asked to describe the group for women on a perennially unorganized campus, she introduced it this way:

> Feminists in the University of Wisconsin have one very strong asset, that of being organized for action in the Wisconsin Coordinating Council of Women in Higher Education, founded in October 1971 . . . . The WCCWHE is a strictly unofficial body with member groups on the various campuses. It is concerned with supporting and monitoring the progress of affirmative action for all UW women, and was the first statewide group of this nature to be established in any university system anywhere.
>
> Through participation in WCCWHE, feminists in the University of Wisconsin are doing away with the barriers of powerlessness and isolation which have functioned to keep women down for so long. As individuals excluded from the white male power structure, we have lacked political clout, but joined together in the coordinating council our potential power, at least, is substantial. Although still shut out of the "old boys' network," UW System women now have a network of their own. The coordinating council meets

> regularly through the year, each time on a different campus, and a constant exchange of information and mutual help has resulted from these meetings.[3]

The origins of feminist activism in the UW System lie on all campuses; it was in the air. However, the organizing strike came from the Madison campus. In October, 1970 (as described by Ruth Bleier in this volume) women on the Madison campus learned that a sex discrimination complaint, lodged against the university had been quietly and superficially investigated by a team of federal civil rights officials during the summer. A number of women (students, faculty, other employees, and faculty wives) had been studying and protesting women's status on campus for somewhat over a year, and they thought it unlikely that these officials got straight, full answers to their questions. Their own research made it clear that the university was not in compliance with federal affirmative action requirements.[4] Most importantly, the failure of these officials to talk to any concerned women was enough to galvanize many women not yet drawn into activism. They formed the Association of Faculty Women (AFW), which was, from the beginning, in spite of its name, concerned with problems experienced by all women on the Madison campus.

This broad interest and AFW's great ambitions spilled over into concern for women in higher education statewide. It was probably fueled by awareness of the reorganization of higher public education taking place in Wisconsin at this time. The major event was the merger of a set of four-year colleges with a set of universities and their two-year regional centers. With merger the state would have one public system, the University of Wisconsin System, of which the Madison campus formally became but one unit.

I mention this bit of history because it shows an important dimension to the vision the Madison women had when they decided to organize women statewide. They could see that they were dealing with problems that pervaded the whole system and that they would do well to join with women from other campuses to fashion remedies for the whole system.

Once the idea of statewide action took hold, the AFW, led by Joan Roberts and Ruth Bleier, felt that the matter was urgent and worked as fast as they could. Ruth Bleier's early history captures the excitement of this organizing better than a retelling could:

> We had little time to prepare and few real contacts on other campuses, yet close to 100 women from 19 campuses attended and formed the Coordinating Council of Women in Higher Education.... The first important characteristic to note about the initial and subsequent meetings has been the remarkable atmosphere of mutual confidence and commitment that permits free discussion and the making of important decisions by consensus. Second was the urgent stimulus the conference provided for the organization of women on the various campuses. Many faculty women, previously working in isolation and mainly with students, returned to their campuses with some new insights, visions or inspirations. . .and proceeded to call meetings attended by more than half the women on campus. Coming from all corners of the state, we now represent a political and social force that cannot easily be ignored.''[5]

Bleier mentions the "atmosphere of mutual confidence" that marked the first meeting. That doesn't mean that elitism and jealousy were not expected — in fact, one memo between campus representatives mentioned the fear of Madison elitism specifically. But the fear was unjustifed and the problem of campus rivalry lived on mainly as a source of banter.

What Bleier didn't mention, probably because it seemed only to be expected at the time, was the magnitude of plans and goals that the women took on from the beginning. For starters, they planned to organize a statewide women's communication network, establish connections in as-yet unorganized campuses, organize a resource list of instructors who could lecture on women's issues, prod the university administration into a full scale statistical analysis of women's place in Wisconsin higher education, and obtain recognition of women's groups and placement of their members in important jobs and on important committees. By the third meeting, in December of 1971, they had added plans to try to pry the report of the Madison campus investigation by federal officials out of the administration or HEW (a report which was never written); to write letters of protest about various matters; to deal with the problem of unsatisfactory grievance procedures, fringe benefits and day care availability; to work for the development of women's studies; and to promote the establishment of offices for women on individual campuses and in the central administration. The news release from this meeting said, "Of particular interest to the council is the recruitment, hiring, promotion, pay and appointment of classified and faculty women within higher education."[6] Also mentioned was concern for "the admission, counseling, and financial aids for women students on both the undergraduate and graduate levels."

The first two coordinators of the group were Joan Roberts from Madison and Annette Harrison from River Falls. Their first task was to establish contact with central administration. The outcome of these meetings was mixed. The matter of establishing an office for women in central received apparent endorsement, but some of their other concerns were not given a warm reception. In a pro forma letter to President John Weaver, they mentioned meeting with four men and praised the receptive attitudes on the part of two without mentioning the third and fourth parties. On hindsight it is apparent that the mixed reception the coordinators received during their first visit was to be the rule for contact with central and that the jaundiced view taken of WCCWHE by some administrators posed a formidable barrier to their goals.

A few days after this letter to President Weaver was written, Annette Harrison died suddenly, overcome by car exhaust fumes. It was the kind of meaningless death that stuns a group and a great loss, but Pat Clark of River Falls was named to take Harrison's place and WCCWHE continued to meet monthly — which meant much travel for many members — until May. The network was established and the flow of mail and memos to and from administrators and between campuses became a flood.

Great Ambitions, Great Projects

This flow of mail and memos belies the early — and realistic — concern CC members felt about the reliability of their communication network. In retrospect one can see that the problems were not serious in the first year not only because WCCWHE was meeting monthly but also because communication was continuously fueled by the many issues that were a source of stimulation to planning and action. Again, the scope of WCCWHE's ongoing concerns is best illustrated by the impressive list of issues and actions that came up between the fourth meeting (January, 1972) and the sixth (April, 1972).

Seven position papers were prepared.[7] One outlined the position of women administrators in the system, also mentioning tenure for part-timers and the need for more women on committees. Another concerned childcare options and lack of them on various campuses. A proposal to establish grievance procedures for use by classified, academic staff, tenured faculty and students was prepared. This proposal included components of outreach (to educate women about their rights), provision of advocates for women (since the administration's supposedly neutral participants are actually employer representatives), and conciliation. Another proposal detailed the establishment of offices of women on all campuses and described some administrative responses to existing proposals. A paper by UW-Miwaukee women proposed establishment of a women's studies program. (They also began looking for grant support and began an intercampus support system and clearinghouse for women's studies information.) The fifth paper outlined needs for data on the position of women (students and employees at all ranks) in the system. The sixth outlined problems of and made recommendations on admissions, financial aid, counseling, and curriculum for women students. And finally, a paper was written on bringing women from private institutions into WCCWHE activities.[8]

These were only the formally recognized major projects. A variety of other activities were also going on that were equally important and time-consuming. They included attempts to get HEW to review affirmative action on all UW campuses; backing Madison women's legal action for retroactive equity pay; liaison with other women's groups; writing by-laws for WCCWHE; working on a sex discrimination case; and studying the status of women graduate students, inequities in fringe benefits, rules and regulations for classified staff, and the representation of women in various policy making activities.

A major early product of all this work was a five-page proposal to chancellors, regents, and the president that listed the issues WCCWHE had become concerned with. This proposal listed eleven steps to be taken immediately, measures that WCCWHE regarded as "but a start of a larger program for women in the university." The four pages of information that followed this list represent a substantial information-gathering effort on WCCWHE's part and a greater understanding of the structure of the university than its employees usually have. CC members were often criticized, publicly and privately, for lack of understanding of academia's working structure. Sometimes it was justified criticism, but what the critics don't mention is that it takes even insiders a long time to understand that how academia works in reality is not how it works on paper. Although in retrospect some of WCCWHE's hopes for administrative action were naive, they understood very well, even this early, where the problems must be attacked.

Unfortunately WCCWHE had no power to compel responses to their proposal. Later, CC members Joan Roberts, Ruth Bleier, and Pat Clark met with the council of chancellors and put more elaborated and specific proposals to them. It was a dismal meeting, without any encouraging reaction from the chancellors. However, they wrote a follow-up letter to the chancellors (April 12, 1972), detailing the need for campus offices of women with specific responsibilities for analysis of women's position in the campus workforce and salary structure, establishment of hiring and promotion goals and monitoring of women's progress, a job clearinghouse, better grievance procedures, training programs for classified staff and academic employees to increase advancement opportunities, women's studies programs, and attention to admissions, financial aids, career development services, continuing education and counseling for women students. They politely suggested that campus administrators should strive for cooperation with campus women's groups, not avoid it. This would be accomplished by appointment of a commission for women on each campus and establishment of formal communication links between women's groups and the proposed office of women in central administration.

This seven-page document ended with an answer to a question that Stevens Point's Chancellor Lee Dreyfus had posed at the face-to-face meeting: "Yes, the status of women is top priority. Women have waited too long to be considered equal human beings. We are determined to bring that period of waiting to an end." The declaration was probably in vain. The chancellors tended to see the "problem of women" as a short term employment problem to be remedied at the lowest cost possible. Nancy Knaak, author of the paper on women students' problems, ended with a blunt statement of what CC members privately acknowledged: "In all of these [areas] there exists the awful frustration of powerlessness." She mentioned the "endless individual recitations" of inequities that she encountered and the fear that even the best intentions of the institution's policy makers would be undermined by the "unexamined sexism" of individual administrators and ongoing processes beyond women's power to change.

Encountering Reality: The Second and Third Years

As the quotation from Knaak shows, even during this time of extraordinary ambition and activity there were discordant notes reflecting the difficulties that CC members faced. The institutional sexism and less-than-democratic power structure of academia constituted a bruising reality. The individual cases that came up at various meetings tended to have appalling endings. Reports from campus committees on the status of women indicated there were still people who did not believe that sex discrimination existed. Affirmative action officers tended to be, with one or two exceptions, little more sympathetic. Many of the officers were white men. Women's studies course proposals were often met with amusement. And finally, the problem of widening WCCWHE's base was chronic. The organization had a solid representation on about half a dozen campuses and a good beginning on a few others, but the campus groups did not seem to be growing.

The first meeting of 1972-73 was in Superior. Joan Roberts and Ruth Bleier reported on their meeting with the regents in June. The male regents' reception of the CC representatives was "a spontaneous show of contempt," as one campus's protest letter put it. The men (with one exception) did not pretend to listen; several got up and wandered out during the CC presentation. It is perhaps significant that a new agenda item at the September meeting was creation of a committee to look into court action as a means of bringing about change in the system.

The 1972-73 meetings, chaired by new coordinators Mary Jo Buggs from Stevens Point and Edna Hood from Eau Claire, changed from focus on large-scale outrages to more focus on specific cases and immediate issues. On one hand, central's work for affirmative action on individual campuses seemed to be going forward and central's office for women was in operation. Marian Swoboda, with WCCWHE's support, was appointed to direct the office. On the other hand, the new system budget did not have funds to carry out the kind of affirmative action that WCCWHE envisioned. System affirmative action guidelines went out to each chancellor but they were, as the minutes of the November, 1972 meeting put it, "subject to interpretation."

All this led to a dialogue between Swoboda and the now-experienced women on what central should or could do to make individual campuses cooperate with women's groups. The reality of post-merger organizational structure took a while to learn. The reality was that central could pursue a coordinating course that was effective only as long as "campus autonomy" was not breached. There might be some chancellors, at one time or another, who look on central's guidelines as helpful, or at least to be partially attended to, or who are willing to listen to Swoboda's advice on affirmative action problems. But the power to go from plans to action was in the chancellor's hands.

One result of this dawning sophistication about power realities was an effort by CC members to educate themselves into the sometimes byzantine contours of policy making and implementation. For example, the November, 1972 minutes included a list of sixteen publications on women in higher education and an outline of sex discrimination laws. At various meetings the group had speakers on budget processes, affirmative action, and legislation.

The infusion of cynicism into CC members' attitudes and expectations is well illustrated by an event of December of 1972. Swoboda was an assistant to the UW System president at this point, with duties involving affirmative action for women. An appointment that was expected to be parallel for minorities went to a minority man, Joseph Wiley. The jolt was his salary: $12,500 higher than Swoboda's — more than half again as much. Why? The explanation was that Wiley's salary merely matched what he was getting in his previous job. But, women retorted, it's illegal, and federal guidelines cover this situation explicitly.[9] The end result was moderately gratifying, if not a complete victory. Swoboda's salary was raised $6,000 — closing half the gap — and job descriptions were made up which seemed, on the surface, to justify Wiley's still higher pay.

In spite of all this, there was a feeling of progress in some areas such as women's studies and affirmative action, though little by way of full-fledged programs yet. The Madison AFW had produced an impressive model affirmative action plan. WCCWHE adopted this, somewhat modified, to distribute as their model. After the unpleasant reception CC women had received from the Board of Regents, a new strategy for approaching this group was devised. By February of 1973, CC representatives had visited with seven of the sixteen regents. Some visits were unsatisfactory, and two regents refused to talk to them at all, but at least some regents were found who were willing to listen to WCCWHE concerns.

Thus WCCWHE entered its third year (1973-74) with mixed pessmism and optimism. An item on the first meeting's agenda put it succinctly: "Campus reports — what happened (or didn't) over the summer." The feeling was that we had reached a dead end in some areas. We had learned to present our case forcefully and were regarded as radicals by some, perhaps even dangerously radical. At any rate, we apparently violated some important rules of female propriety. For example, for us to publicly accuse a chancellor of deliberately excluding women from policy making was, according to one distressed CC member, "unmitigated rudeness"; when minorities and white males made such accusations it was seen as understandable anger. But years later CC members were still paying for it in the form of exclusion from committees and other forms of participation in the academic community.

At the same time, some action early in this third year yielded evidence that WCCWHE (now coordinated by Mary Jo Buggs from Stevens Point and Leticia Smith from Whitewater) had become a pressure group to be reckoned with. A strongly worded resolution was passed expressing concern over suggested changes in the graduate mission of some campuses, changes that would probably reduce women's education options more than men's. The resolution went out with cover letters to the appropriate groups and this time WCCWHE's letter-writing drew replies. Some expressed solidarity and described other efforts to curb these plans, while some from administrators were either politely noncommittal or accused CC members of not understanding things.

Other heartening things were happening. A system task force to promote development of women's studies was established in late 1973. In April of 1974 central funded a minority women's conference — which led to an important WCCWHE conference, to be described below. A program for administrative interns in central was begun. This program was designed to give minorities and women experience that might open opportunities for them in higher education administration.

On the other hand — WCCWHE history is a seesaw matter in these middle years — adequate data on women's status on individual campuses and their advancement or lack of it was not to be had.[10] We didn't know then that by Wisconsin law we were entitled to examine all records for ourselves. What was published was found to be incomplete very often and sometimes seemed to be deliberately misleading. The facts we knew were disturbing. Some tenured faculty had recently been given lay-off notices due to financial cutbacks; 31% were women, at least twice the representation of women among all tenured faculty. In June of 1974 we took stock of the pending legal complaints that we knew of; there were eight. And worst of all we saw our friends not winning their job renewals.

The major blow in this middle period was the failure of one of WCCWHE's founders to be granted tenure. The applicant was Joan Roberts, from the department of educational policy studies on the Madison campus. At issue was the value of her scholarly work, which the department said did not meet standards. But in CC members' eyes she was a leader — with a national reputation — in women's studies. The mass demonstrations against Roberts' tenure denial probably didn't help her any, nor was there anything concrete that WCCWHE could do to help.

At the same time the women's studies task force was being formed within system administration to study the issue of women's studies. WCCWHE's chosen representative was Joan Roberts. Needless to say she was not appointed. Five CC members put much thought into a critical analysis of the final draft, however, and came up with several recommendations for specific changes.[11] These were presented both to the academic vice president and others working with the task force. It was a new experience for CC members.

The oral discussion was straightforward and centered on content issues. While a few points were lost, most of them were won. The final draft took some of our criticism into account (as well as those from other women who had attended an open meeting on the matter). This, then, counts as one of the accomplishments that belongs in the next section of this history. WCCWHE was not directly responsible as an organization for a good start in women's studies in the UW System, but many of our members were directly involved on their campuses and the organization's interest, letter-writing, committee work, research, and intellectual labor constituted pressure toward this good start and an influence on the final shape of system policy.

Real But Limited Accomplishments: The Fourth Year, 1974-75

The preceding section closed with a somewhat prideful account of how the UW System came to support the development of women's studies. It wasn't a revolution and it wasn't a solid in-place reform; it was limited but still something to boast about.

The 1974-75 year didn't start out as optimistic as the women's studies situation might suggest. It was hard to find replacements for the coordinators; Hope Underwood from Whitewater and Joan Yeatman from LaCrosse were finally persuaded to serve. We still felt we had to try to get the regents' attention but they were still resistant, regarding us as more of a nuisance than a legitimate pressure group. At our first meeting in September we discussed communication problems, which amounted to our continuing inability to understand how the system worked. We couldn't get affirmative action officers to talk to us (except defensively) and we couldn't get them to act. We couldn't even figure out what they had the power to do.

On the other hand, at the same meeting we began to plan a conference which, in retrospect, seems to be the most important action of WCCWHE's first half dozen years. This action was initially called a "conference of women of all colors," since it grew out of a perceived need for an expanded version of an April, 1974 conference of minority women. The April conference was funded by central, on the assumption that holding conferences like this creates legitimate and useful communication channels.

The logistics were worked out by Mary Jo Buggs, Edi Bjorklund, and Swoboda's office. Abisola Gallagher, the administrative intern then in place, provided valuable service in shaping the conference, as did the office's secretary, Georgia Fatsis.

Conference topics covered all areas, from training and mobility of classified employees, to affirmative action for minority women, to the status of (nontenure track, nonclassified) academic staff women, to grievance procedures. Each system unit sent three delegates, including at least one minority woman and one classified staff woman. We met in Lake Delton for a day and a half — but if you include the two evenings of work, one of which lasted until about 1:00 a.m., actually two to three days of work went into the conference.

The outcome was "fantastic," "productive far beyond our most ambitious hopes." It was hard to avoid superlatives after it was over. One of the important accomplishments, we felt, was that it was a conference of UW women of all races and employment classes working together.

The work was not over when the conference was over. The goal was to produce policy recommendations in each area covered. There was a general resolution directed toward the elimination of sexism and racism in public higher education in Wisconsin.[12] The rest of the resolutions and drafts of papers concerned specific actions and changes.

The first step was to integrate the material into documents for different purposes. A summary was prepared for the regents and a longer report to Vice President Donald Percy in his capacity as equal employment opportunity officer for the UW System. One recommendation was the establishment of a systemwide task force that would study classified personnel problems in depth. Another document was prepared on the status of academic staff women. This was sent to the systemwide committee working on academic staff personnel rules.

The documents had mixed effects. The academic staff recommendations were studied by the task force formulating academic staff rules. One side effect was that the paper served to stimulate organization of a group on the Madison campus to develop and protect academic staff job rights. Our reception by the regents this time was much more cordial, and some of our recommendations are echoed in a strong "Restatement of Policy on Equal Employment Opportunity" adopted August 15, 1975. The report to and subsequent meeting with Vice President Percy was moderately hopeful.

The recommendation for forming a classified staff task force was never carried out. The administrators believed that the problems listed were individual problems to be dealt with by supervisory personnel, not problems that called for any major changes in personnel rules or workforce structure. Affirmative action, it was believed, was not the province of personnel directors.

It is undoubtedly the attitude of these administrators that explained the fact that the classified task force staff never came into being. It was supposedly about to, several times, but as WCCWHE began to lose its steam, inquiries about when it would be formed came no more and the matter is now buried in the files.

Activity Drops Off to — Hibernation?

The depressing fate of promised action on behalf of classified staff marks the chapter of WCCWHE history that goes from summer, 1975, through fall, 1979. This part is brief, not because the issues were no longer there and nothing was happening, nor because there weren't people trying to make things happen, but because progress was not being made. Many CC members were suffering from burn-out, and few new women were coming forward to take their place.

Very soon after the high of the Lake Delton conference, in March of 1975, one letter spoke of the campus organizations as becoming moribund, of "the original momentum, solidarity, and commitment which feminists had nationally several years ago . . . being replaced by apathy, discouragement, despair."[13] She went on, "As academic women in particular see their efforts constantly frustrated, see repeated failures to bring about significant changes in their institutions, see that cutbacks and layoffs throughout education are rapidly taking away the little we have so laboriously gained, at such heavy personal cost, many of us are losing heart. Our energies are depleted. We are, often, weeded out by the 'sifting and winnowing' process, a good way to get rid of the most active feminists among us. Those who remain may live in fear. I am not always confident that we *can* survive, either collectively or as individuals . . ."

This letter was prompted by a proposal to cut the number of WCCWHE meetings since attendance had dropped off so much. The proposal did not show much promise for changing things because it relied on the existence of active local groups. The fact was that the activists saw participation at the local level dwindling even faster than participation at WCCWHE meetings — at least at the latter they could find more than one or two other steadfast activists.

This process of dwindling activism took some time. New coordinators were found for 1975-76 (Vivian Wood from Madison and Judith Herrold from Stevens Point); in 1976-77 Judith Herrold stayed on as coordinator and was joined by Pat Meller of Madison. In 1977-78 Meller stayed on and was joined by Mary Meiser from Eau Claire. Meiser made a great effort to hold the group together from spring of 1978 on, but meetings ceased in February of 1979. In the months since then, Meiser has managed to maintain some inter-campus contacts, however, and to reestablish a telephone network in the fall of 1979, when interest in affirmative action for women seemed to be reviving.

During these four years some activities went forward. Outrages of various sorts still brought WCCWHE responses. There was the letter writing in support of legislation, commenting on such things as proposed changes in federal affirmative action guidelines and proposed Title IX guidelines. The issue of women and retirement benefits took up member attention for some time. But our letters no longer always got responses, even letters to those who had been involved in the 1974 conference on affirmative action. The attempted follow-up on the various recommendations and reports from this conference fizzled out. The replies that did come in were bad news anyway. In spite of the effort put forth by the coordinators, the drive to improve women's status in the system was just barely sustained at slow speed.

What did go forward during these years was women's studies. Where it isn't thriving it is at least surviving. Many of the programs are populated with ex-CC members — who may still be available for action if the climate for women was suddenly revealed to be as poor now as it was in 1971. It may be that WCCWHE still lives on, in a sense, in women's studies programs. At any rate, we know that some of WCCWHE's energy loss was due to a transfer to women's studies.

Aside from women's studies, and issues that one assumes are monitored through women's studies, there remains a host of women's issues in Wisconsin higher education that are no longer being addressed by any very active group. These have to do mainly with employment, at all ranks. The systemwide representation of faculty women has gone up less than two percentage points over the course of seven years; the academic staff is still unanalyzed and unregulated; the complaints from classified personnel haven't changed or ceased. It's of interest that the agendas for some 1977-78 meetings that the WCCWHE coordinator and some active CC members had with administrators in central also covered the familiar lists, and elicited familiar responses about campus autonomy, campus cutbacks, and WCCWHE's lack of understanding. The position paper presented to Vice President Donald Smith in June of 1978 shows how much of the early agenda remained to be accomplished.

WCCWHE still had some funds, which came in part from royalties on Joan Roberts' edited collection of lectures originally given in her early women's studies course.[14] One year some of this was used to fund prizes for essays submitted by undergraduates in women's studies. At the fall, 1978 meeting, members tried to revise (and revive) WCCWHE goal-setting, and eventually some of the money was used to make up brochures describing these goals and WCCWHE's history. Funds were also used to support programmed meetings designed to revitalize WCCWHE. The speakers list for the September, 1978, meeting is impressive. Forty women attended discussions of women in administration and women and the unions, but this didn't lead to sustained action.

WCCWHE's drift to almost inactive status is not to be blamed on the members but on the whole situation — the burn-out of old members, failure of university hiring to replace departing or tired CC members with feminists or even potential feminists, and most of all on the intractability of institutional sexism, those practices that keep women down (in the lower ranks) or out even in the absence of overt sexism on the part of individuals. We can only hope that WCCWHE isn't dead or a mere shell of its former self, but rather that it is merely hibernating and ready to spring back to life when the proper climate presents itself.

Postscript

And it may do just that. As a fringe benefit of being the author of one of the last articles in this volume to go to the printer, I get to report that there is a revival of interest in the status of women in the UW System, in the form of a regents' task force, a group appointed by the president of the Board of Regents to study the effectiveness of the regent policy document developed largely from the recommendations from the 1975 Lake Delton conference. It has created the stimulus for the revival of meeting plans among WCCWHE survivors. Those survivors, it turns out, still remember the unresolved business from 1975 and the skepticism over the years about whether or not the regents' policies were really effective. Will we find the energy and the people to begin the effort again? The chapter has to end here. We don't yet know the answers.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 3

1. I began active participation in WCCWHE in spring of 1974. The early history is written from the files and my knowledge of Madison's AFW history. (See Ruth Bleier's chapter, this volume.) Sources for all statements are WCCWHE minutes and correspondence unless otherwise specified. When I use "we" in the article, I am speaking for all active members over the years.
2. This organization was usually referred to as the Coordinating Council and sometimes as WCCWHE in print. I will use CC as a shorthand tag for people and WCCWHE for the organization itself.

3. Edi Bjorklund, letter to Rita Tallent, November 18, 1974.

5. See Elaine Reuben, "Women in the Multiversity," in Philip Altback (ed.), *Academic Supermarkets* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971): 210-227, and Bonnie Cook Freeman, "The Women's Movement and the University," this volume.

5. Ruth Bleier, "Women and the Wisconsin Experience," *College English* (October, 1972) 34: 100-106.

6. It was interesting to find that the academic staff was not mentioned — it is a very large workforce of more than 4,000 in the system, not even counting teaching assistants, interns and residents and postdoctoral researchers. Later WCCWHE's academic staff members managed to make themselves quite visible within the group.

7. The final authorship of these papers is not clear. Those mentioned in connection with these papers are Helen Corneli, Edi Bjorklund, Susan Thurin, Alice Randlett, Nancy Knaak (two papers), Joan Roberts and Sister Joel Read.

8. The original plan was to work with women in both private and public higher education in Wisconsin. The first meetings had representatives from private colleges. Many of WCCWHE's concerns were those of private college women as well as UW women but women from the private colleges dropped out of the group fairly early. Perhaps this reflected WCCWHE's focus on UW administrations or perhaps private college women had even less job security than UW women.

9. *The Capital Times*, December 9, 1972.

10. An "on the other hand" item that must be mentioned is the death of Joyce Telzrow, from a brain tumor on January 13, 1974. Joyce was a founder of WCCWHE, present at the first meeting, and an active worker until she died. A memorial fund created by her friends provides aid to women studying foreign languages.

11. Members of the committee were: Leticia Smith, Edith Bjorklund, Agate Krouse, Jacqueline Macaulay and Jacqueline Ross.

12. Some of central's administrators who had had "trouble" with "those women" in the past must have been startled by parts of this resolution. We commended Vice President Percy for showing "willingness to communicate with and be responsive to the concerns of system employees and students who are affected by affirmative action programs. . .responsive to both the letter and the spirit of affirmative action. . ." But then they probably never noticed that our past denunciations of central actions had not been blanket ones.

13. Edi Bjorklund, letter to Joan Yeatman, March 17, 1975.

14. Joan Roberts (ed.), *Beyond Intellectual Sexism: A New Woman, A New Reality* (David McKay, 1976).

4. Committee on the Status of Women — Milwaukee

by Jane Crisler

In a report issued on the status of women at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee in 1970-71, women represented 11 percent of the university's professors, 15 percent of associate professors, and 44 percent of the student body. According to the equal opportunity report published in September of 1976, women were 11 percent of the professors, 14 percent of associate professors, and the institutional studies enrollment report showed they were 46.67 percent of the student body. The remarkable correspondence of these numbers leads to the obvious question: Has any progress been made in the status of academic women during the past five years?

The stagnation shown by the statistical measures of the status of academic women is not only dismal, but frustrating. It is frustrating because the last ten years have been the "affirmative action" decade. The executive order requiring affirmative action in realizing equal employment status of women was enacted in 1967. If, during the intervening years, the conventional measures show no perceptible narrowing of the employment gap between men and women in the university, the impact of the women's movement upon the university may be questioned.

For those who are actually members of the academic community, however, who know the statistics, but also live with the daily realities of the academic community, the impact has been substantial. The real impact, measured in human terms, is truly a feminist accomplishment, and has been realized primarily through the efforts of the women themselves. They have proved themselves to be competent members of the academic community and have organized to support each other psychologically and professionally. In increasing their own participation in the university, academic women have enhanced the educational environment for all its members. As teachers, counselors, administrators, they have served as positive role models for their colleagues and students, demonstrating the contribution women can make to higher education and society in general.

At the same time that the university was evaluating the status of academic women in 1971 to fulfill the requirements of pertinent federal and state laws, a group of concerned faculty, academic staff, and students formed an unofficial committee to study the issues and work for change to improve the status of academic women in the university. The committee on the status of academic women (CSAW) was founded as an ad hoc group (for its first four years it carried this temporary designation in its title) by (then) Associate Professor Janet Egleson Dunleavy of the English department and Assistant Professor Hiasura Rubenstein of the school of social welfare. They served as coordinators of the organization for the first year.

The early goals of the organization were: education of the university community to the concerns of academic women, preparation of recommendations for the administration to correct discrimination, election and appointment of more women to university committees, and the development of women's studies. In its first year, the committee had sixty-four dues-paying members and in the following five years doubled its official membership.

Through a system of informal subcommittees, interested persons studied issues of primary concern to women. During the first five years of the committee's existence, many of the proposals advanced by the committee in these areas have been espoused by the campus administration and faculty groups and have become a part of the mainstream of the university's daily life. One of the original subcommittees, women's studies, was organized by Edi Bjorklund of the library and Angela Peckenpaugh, a lecturer in the English department. Perceiving the need for specific courses or portions of existing courses to be devoted to the study of women and their role in various fields of study, they surveyed student and faculty interests, worked with university departments and other units to bring lecturers to campus to speak on subjects of particular interest to women. The subcommittee developed a proposal for a women's studies program at the university and submitted it to Chancellor J. Martin Klotsche. Lenore Harmon, then director of counseling (and a founding member of CSAW) was instrumental in establishing the program. In her capacity as advisor to the chancellor on the status of women, she lobbied for the program. As a result of these combined efforts, funds for the program were included in the 1973-74 budget and Lenore Harmon was named coordinator of the program in February, 1974. In 1975 she was succeeded by Rachel Skalitzky of the comparative literature department.

Another issue of immediate concern to women, the need for day care, was studied by the fringe benefits subcommittee. Chaired by Carole Shammas of the history department, the subcommittee surveyed faculty, academic staff, and students to determine the type of care preferred, times of day required, and the hourly cost which could be realistically charged. The study demonstrated, through statistical evidence, the pressing need for such facilities by all members of the university. A university task force subsequently addressed the matter and issued recommendations which led to the establishment of a campus-wide center with a quality care and educational program.

Since its beginning, the committee has been concerned with federal affirmative action regulations and non-discrimination legislation. One of its early activities was the study of faculty salaries by a research subcommittee chaired by Elinor Partridge and Dorothy Grover. Members of this subcommittee spent innumerable hours in the library culling statistics from the printed budget to compare the salaries of male and female faculty members of equivalent rank. The findings were discouraging, showing that although equity raises were accorded to many women, difference in average salary for the 1971-72 academic year ranged from $1,620 at the full professor rank (15 of 186 were women) to $105 at the instructor level (11 of 44 were women). These facts were brought to the attention of the faculty through a memorandum pointing out the discrepancies and raising questions about possible sex discrimination. In recent years, the AAUP has adopted a format for its annual faculty report which provides salary breakdowns by sex and rank.

The University of Wisconsin System has long taken pride in the fundamental role accorded to faculty governance in the operation of the university. Recognizing the importance of the governance processes, another continuing goal of CSAW has been to support individuals for election and appointment to committees who will represent the interests of women. During the 1971-72 academic year, women held 16 percent of elected committee positions. In 1972-73, they constituted 25 percent of elected committee members. The committee has been successful in realizing its goal of bringing women into the mainstream of faculty governance; supporters of women have been elected to every committee in the faculty governance structure for the last two years. In addition, the committee has solicited the names of faculty and academic staff members supportive of women who would be available for appointment to committees and special task forces. These names have been forwarded to the university committee and the academic staff committee to draw from in making appointments.

As academic women on the UW-Milwaukee campus became organized and worked together to achieve common goals, they extended their view beyond the immediately obvious issues, such as salary, to other areas that required equal participation for women in the university. In 1974, CSAW undertook as a special project the coordination of its activities with those of the Association of Black Professionals. The committee held a joint reception with women of the UW-Milwaukee classified staff and sent representatives to attend the statewide conference on minority women sponsored by the UW System in November, 1974.

During the 1975-76 academic year, the CSAW was deeply involved in the campus-wide self-evaluation conducted in compliance with Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972. The self-evaluation task force, appointed by Chancellor Werner Baum in February, was composed of individuals primarily concerned with improving the educational opportunities of all students. Task force members were: Bernice J. Wolfson, coordinator; Helen Batchelor, ex officio; Cornelius P. Cotter, Jane Crisler, Lenore W. Harmon, Douglas S. Lueck, Renee Rendahl, Cecilia Ridgeway, Charles Rychner, and Walter B. Weare.

The task force conducted its evaluation through questionnaires, data analyses, open hearings, and special meetings. To promote campus participation in the evaluation and a discussion of the subtle issues of sexism, the CSAW prepared an informational background sheet on Title IX and distributed it to the women on campus. The committee also prepared a written statement on the status of women and presented it to the task force in an open hearing. Through many levels of participation on the task force, the CSAW contributed constructive observations and recommendations to the evaluation process. Since the final report of the task force was prepared in July of 1976, the committee has followed closely the university's efforts in complying with the regulations.

Two areas of compliance were of particular concern to CSAW: equal pay and grievance procedures. The task force was unable to determine the absence or presence of sex discrimination in employee salaries from the information provided by the university. Long concerned about the right to grieve a situation of sex discrimination and receive redress, the CSAW has included among its subcommittees one on grievance procedures. It has offered counseling on available grievance mechanisms to those who feel they have suffered sex discrimination and accompanied grievants during hearings.

The CSAW entered its fifth year with a substantial record of achievement in improving the status of academic women at UW-Milwaukee. The impact of women in the university is not immediately apparent from the quantitative measures of employment statistics which have remained relatively static over the past five years. Rather, the record of achievement is built on the accomplishments of individuals. The committee's success has, in large part, been due to the informal nature of its operation. The members work cooperatively in their areas of interest, and volunteer coordinators donate their services in organizing the work of the committee. The coordinators for the first seven years of the committee's history were: 1971-72, Hiasura Rubenstein and Janet Dunleavy; 1972-73, Elinor Partridge and Jane Crisler (Semester I), Cecilia Ridgeway (Semester II); 1973-74, Elinor Partridge and Cecilia Ridgeway; 1974-75, Katharine Quina-Holland; 1975-76, Jane Crisler; 1976-77, Beth Ewing and Marilyn Moon; and 1977-78, Mary Conway.

Many other members have freely given their time and support to the committee's activities.

On November 7, 1971 Hiasura Rubenstein and Ethel Sloane served as CSAW delegates to the organizing meeting of the Wisconsin Coordinating Council of Women in Higher Education. In recent years, Edi Bjorklund has served as the Milwaukee representative to the Council. In other areas, Sally Derrwaldt has served as a resource person for affirmative action and student counseling; Ethel Sloane as a faculty governance advisor, especially in the area of grievances; Eunice Thielen and Carole Shammas have shared the responsibility of treasurer; Janet Dunleavy has worked on affirmative action with Marilyn Moon and joined Sharon Murphy, Beth Ewing, and Rachel Skalitzky in publicizing the committee's activities.

Rachel Skalitzky, Lenore Harmon and other members of the governance subcommittee have been especially active in nominating women for the faculty senate and other governance bodies. Elsa Shipman of the English department was one of the first faculty members to teach women's studies courses and was an active committee member until her death in the spring of 1977.

Surely the most important contribution women have made to the university has been made in the area of educational programs. Members of CSAW and other faculty, staff, and students have worked hard over the years to identify the role of women in our society and make it easier for other women to realize their potential. A few of the special programs about women held in recent years are: A Week with French Women, 1975; Contemporary Trends: New Feminism, New Masculism, 1975; Careers for Women, 1976; Remember the Ladies, 1976; Women in Science, 1977.

The common theme of all of these programs is their student orientation. The commitment of academic women to making the university environment more receptive to and supportive of women students is their most meaningful contribution to the university. In working to improve the status of academic women at UW-Milwaukee, they are fulfilling the primary responsibility of their profession: providing the best education possible in an equitable manner.

5. Graduate Women Assess the Campus

A Case in Point about Sexism

by Jane Van Dyk

> Most professors still seem to have the impression that women will drop out of the program (and later a job) so they are just taking up a place some man could have . . . One of my professors suggested it best if I didn't complete the Ph.D. because I would be pricing myself out of the marriage market.

> I was refused a teaching assistantship until I could prove that I was a serious student and not just filling up my empty days. This same professor offered me a job as a secretary in the department.

> When I asked why I was refused admittance (to the school of pharmacy) I was told that they preferred males to females because males are more stable and they had had trouble in the past with females quitting the program. Also, since I am married, they told me I would probably not use the training I would get because most married women had children.

> When I was working on my master's degree, I was told that women were too great a risk to be accepted to graduate study in the history department in large numbers. On this basis, the department refused to admit me, despite their admission that I was qualified and more intelligent than their average Ph.D. student. They recommended that I go back to literature — where I belonged (namely, where women belong!)

This essay describes the attitudes and practices encountered by women graduate students on the Madison campus in the early seventies, as described by the women students themselves. Five years ago the Graduate Women's Caucus, a campus-wide organization with a membership of about one hundred which flourished briefly during 1971-72, conducted a written survey of all graduate women to learn of their experiences within their departments and within the institution and to try to understand why some women graduate students leave before completing a Ph.D. Two key questions were asked: (1) During your academic career at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, do you feel that you have experienced discrimination because of your sex? If so, please describe the circumstances; (2) Have you ever considered dropping out of a graduate degree program, and, if so, please describe some of the factors that contributed to this consideration. About half of the 559 respondents answered the first question "yes" and almost two-thirds answered the second question "yes."

Survey respondents described instances of discrimination ranging from efforts made to channel them into professions considered more "seemly" for women to actual exclusion from the department of their choice. Women reported a constant barrage of belittling and suggestive, as well as outright antagonistic, comments and remarks to which they were subjected. We learned that an unofficial double standard existed for admission to the medical school, to the chemistry department, to the history department, the sociology department, and many others. We were told that men are assumed to be serious students while women are assumed to be frivolous until they "prove" their professional dedication. We were told of a professor who took academic reprisals against a woman because she rejected his physical advances. We learned of an invisible bar which effectively kept women out of certain academic pursuits considered to be too tough and demanding for non-serious students like women, who would probably drop out anyway.

But before I go on to report and analyze the survey results in more detail, I think it is important to place the survey within the larger context of what was happening on the campus at that time. During the late sixties and early seventies, women on campuses everywhere were examining virtually the entire structure of the university, evaluating institutional policies and practices for their effect on women. On campus after campus, women were stunning both faculty and administrators with formal accusations of discrimination, and with demands for changes in hiring practices, personnel policies, student admissions, fringe benefits, changes in curriculum content. On the UW-Madison campus, the anger and discontent of women reached the explosive stage in 1971-72. A rapid series of events unfolded that year, which were to have far-reaching effects. I would like to describe the role played by women students in the struggle to bring about change at the university, and to analyze the significance of our activities and experiences.

One of the important "firsts" that year was Professor Joan I. Roberts' experimental course, "Education and the Status of Women." During the course of the semester, thirty women from as many academic disciplines engaged in a dialogue with about forty students about the status of women. The most significant result of the class was the formation of support groups among the students and the faculty members. For the first time women were "bonding," and the foundation was laid for the establishment of women's groups, a network was beginning to take shape.

Perhaps one of the most significant phenomena to occur during the seventies was the proliferation of women's groups. Like wildflowers after a spring rain, groups were springing up in every academic area and in almost every department. What frequently began as a handful of women getting together over a brown bag lunch in the department lounge, quickly blossomed into a full-scale movement, characterized by ever-widening and overlapping circles. Women were forming caucuses in law, in medicine, sociology, psychology, in the Teaching Assistants Association, and in the school of education, to name but a few. Many women were active in several groups simultaneously, thus insuring communication among the diverse campus interests and forging the links of a network which would encompass faculty, staff, classified and student women. The groups provided a source of mutual strength and encouragement to the individual members, and collectively demonstrated the existence of an organized body of women intent on exposing and eliminating inequities wherever they existed.

Of all the groups, the Association of Faculty Women (AFW) deserves special mention. Chaired jointly by Professors Joan I. Roberts and Ruth Bleier, the AFW was one of the first formal feminist organizations on campus, it provided strong leadership on all issues of concern to women, acted as a catalyst in the formation of other groups such as the statewide Coordinating Council of Women in Higher Education and the Graduate Women's Caucus, and provided an ongoing source of support and encouragement to many of the other women's groups.

Most of the women's groups began by collecting data about the discrepancies which existed between the status of men and the status of women. In the early stages this took the form of counting noses. Women began documenting on their home campuses the pattern characteristic of universities across the nation: the dwindling numbers of women at each succeeding rung of the academic ladder. For example, at UW-Madison in 1971-72, as compared to their male counterparts, there were fewer women enrolled as freshmen (44 percent), fewer women at the master's level (36 percent) and still fewer women at the doctoral level (19 percent). Only tiny token minorities of women were enrolled in the professional fields of law and medicine (6 percent and 5 percent). Of all the Ph.D. recipients in the preceding year, only 12 percent were women. Even more discouraging and disheartening was the story for faculty women: out of a faculty of 2,000, there were 157 women with tenure track appointments (7.8 percent), and one half of the 157 were in traditional women's departments. Not counting women in predominantly women's departments, 2.5 percent of full professors were women, 5 percent of the associate professors, and 11 percent of assistant professors. Women were notably absent at all except the lowest ranks of administration.[1]

We graduate women were particularly concerned with the attrition rate between master's and doctoral level, where the proportion of women students dropped from 36 percent to 19 percent. Looking at gross or overall data for the entire university for 1971-72, we found that women held appointments in rough approximation to their enrollment (25 percent to 30 percent) except for one category, research assistant. Women held only 14 percent of the research assistantships. A clear bias was apparent in this category, both in percentage and numbers. The pattern was consistent and cut across almost every department in every school. Research assistantships, involving work directly with faculty on funded studies deemed important by the faculty, have a clear bearing on the speed of progress of the student, the socialization process of the student, and the values inculcated in a graduate education. This bias may have been a means of tracking women away from research, which is probably the most important area for a professional orientation.

After a pattern of bias in research assistantships and anomalies in other categories of support in some departments had been identified, and because of pressure from a number of women's groups, in the spring the chancellor appointed a committee on equity in graduate student appointments and support. When it was announced that the committee was composed of four faculty men, two faculty women, and one female graduate student, the reaction was immediate and angry. Women were "appalled and incensed" that the chancellor would appoint a committee with a majority of male faculty members and only one graduate student to examine attitudes and practices of male faculty toward women graduate students. They blasted the committee as "an incredible violation of decency, let alone ordinary intelligence," and as an attempt to buy time in order to forestall women's efforts. Women students staged a sit-in at the committee's first meeting on May 4, 1972, bombarded the newly appointed members with questions and demanded the resignation of the committee members. None of the members resigned, but, in an appeasement gesture, two other graduate women students were added to the committee, and later as members retired they were replaced by women.

A few days after the sit-in, women student leaders decided to go directly to the Board of Regents to present the problems of women on the campus and to protest the lack of vigorous action by the administration to eliminate discrimination against women employees and students. They planned to cite the specific failure of the university to meet the Department of Health, Education and Welfare's April 1 deadline for submitting an affirmative action program. The women also planned to protest the creation of sham, unrepresentative committees to deal with women's issues. When the board declined to hear the presentation on the grounds that their request had not come up through proper channels, the women refused to leave. They had to be bodily evicted by UW Police Chief Ralph Hanson.

Another clash between women students and the university had taken place earlier that year during the negotiations between the Teaching Assistants Association (TAA) and the administration. For the first time, the TAA was represented by an all-female bargaining team. On the union's agenda were a number of issues of critical importance to women including space for day-care facilities and paternity as well as maternity leave. Fur flew in the bargaining sessions; often it was sexist in nature. "Go back to your knitting," one of the women bargainers was admonished, and when a male TAA negotiator briefly joined the team, he was asked, "Hank, where is your skirt?" At this point, negotiations ground to a halt as women walked out, in protest over what they considered the administration's insensitivity to women's issues and to women.

Nothing was sacred that year, not even that inner sanctum of the old boys' club, the men's locker room. In a move designed to protest the fact that there was no place for women to shower after jogging at the memorial shell, a group of women liberated the locker rooms. A few weeks earlier, women had staged a nude swim-in at the natatorium, to bring attention to the fact that most of the "good" swim hours were assigned exclusively to men or to the men's swim team.

Conferences bloomed that spring too, one of the most important being a "Weekend of Women in Action: Shortening the Longest Revolution," sponsored jointly by women from Joan Roberts' status of women course and community women. The conference was organized to discuss various topics, too often overlooked, such as rape, prostitution, alternative life-styles, lesbianism, and women's health care.

Women in the health sciences center in July of 1972 formed an ad hoc committee and submitted a list of proposals for action to the dean and superintendent of the medical school, with this preamble:

> The temper of women and the exigencies of the times require of the faculty and administration more than a temporary bearing with a difficult situation, but rather a comprehensive and long range program that will guarantee the right and freedom of women to participate fully in the life and processes of the medical center, the university, and society itself. Toward this end, we submit the following proposal for action.

Among the proposals were a request that a commission on women in the health sciences be appointed to assist in the formulation and implementation of policies and programs related to women; that an annual review of admissions procedures and actual admissions of women to medical school be conducted, that graduate and post-doctoral (including residency) training programs be conducted to educate the faculty, administrators, and management personnel regarding attitudes toward women; that the hiring, promotion, transfer, classification, and salary practices of each department be annually reviewed; that grievance procedures be established, and that the establishment of flexible medical school and residency training programs be sought.

Women had the campus in a turmoil that year. Collectively, we were exposing inequities wherever they existed and demanding that the university mend its ways. For a real understanding of the campus climate and how it affected the individual lives of women students, the survey responses tell the story effectively.

Probably the comment most frequently made by the respondents was that women are not taken seriously as students. It seems that many professors still assume that women are just putting in time until "Mr. Right" comes along. One department chairman publicly remarked to his students that women shouldn't have careers — they should get married, have babies, and stay home. Another woman was told by her adviser that he would not recommend her to go on for a Ph.D. because she was the sort of woman who would get married and not use her education and in his estimation she did not have "sufficient professional motivation." Other similar comments were as follows:

> Certain professors feel that women aren't as committed to their studies, aren't as capable of independent work or concentration. They are often viewed as good master's candidates but not doctoral material, more because of attitudinal and personality variables than actual lack of academic experience.

> One professor warned me that a woman with a Ph.D. has a hard time getting married.

> Many professors assume that a woman's career will of course come second, and many still assume that in order to be fulfilled, a woman must follow her "natural instinct" and become a wife and mother.

> Open contempt is shown to females in seminars about their intellectual inferiority. Professors cannot relate to me about anything scholarly. They can only tell me that I am not a "real woman" because I do not want children and marriage. They cannot accept the fact that I am a serious graduate student who happens to be female.

Women reported a constant barrage of belittling, antagonistic remarks from male professors:

> I am in an anti-feminist mood; therefore, I will not take you in my seminar. . . . And there is nothing you can do to change my mind.

> Well, it won't be too long and you'll be married and out of all this anyway.

> You're not as dumb as you look.

> But of course you couldn't take that internship. It involves a summer in Washington and you are married.

> You won't have trouble passing prelims. They have to turn out a woman now and then.

> You are a statistical risk, you know, by virtue of being a woman.

> Come to the department party — there'll be plenty of booze and broads.

One woman in an all male department described how professors made fun of questions she asked in class with comments such as, "Stay in your box," and "What was the question, dearie?" She adds, "In classes I experienced myself as a person to be taken lightly. In one seminar I was never allowed to finish a sentence; there seemed to be a tacit understanding that I never had anything significant to say. Invariably I was called by my first name, while everyone else was Mr. ——. All in all, I was scared, depressed, and 'not measuring up to the competitive atmosphere.' "

Women reported being made to feel unwelcome in many departments and even reported being "channeled" or "redirected" into fields considered more appropriate for women:

> During the period of time in which first-year students interview members of the department faculty (all of whom, incidentally, are male) with the object of selection of a major professor, I was told by one professor that he did not wish to have a woman graduate student.

> When discussing the job market with male professors, I have been told that library work or archival work might be a more promising field for a woman (than history). My fiance, who is also a grad student in history, was once told by a professor with whom he was discussing the job market that I would continue to be a burden to him (my fiance) if I persisted in pursuing a career in teaching and research on the university level.

> My main interest lies in nutritional survey work in foreign countries, and in this area there is blatant prejudice against women. My major professor simply acknowledges it, saying men are better suited to this type of difficult work — whereas women should be content as teachers and dieticians.

Other respondents reported blatant sexist attitudes and overt discriminatory practices:

> Professors imply that women are not as academically qualified as men and were accepted to fill a quota rather than because of personal qualifications.

> I was denied renewal of my TA-ship because I was a professor's wife and told, "You don't need the money because your husband will take care of you." I am often asked by professors why I would want to return to school or prepare for a job, when my husband can support me adequately. I have been told not to expect a job as an academician because my husband is on the staff. I've also been told by fellow students that some professors don't want colleagues' wives in school because "of course, the husband helps his wife do the work."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In my job interviews, people seem to assume that I will follow my husband, even though I tell them that we will go where we can find two jobs. The fact that my husband might follow *me* if I get a good job offer seems never to have occurred to them, and they are dubiously polite when I bring the subject up. One man to whom I applied for a job refused to even consider me once he found that I was married — his rationale was that women go where their husbands go, and they get pregnant.

Women are still expected to make the coffee and do secretarial type things which our male counterparts are never asked to do.

One of my former students (male) was hired for the same position I held and received $2,000 more in yearly salary though I had taught for five years and held the respect of students and colleagues for my teaching abilities.

I was admitted to one seminar because the professor always admitted at least two women to his seminar to add sex appeal for the serious students, the men. This statement is no exaggeration; he announced these things. He said other sexist things often — defended, for example, as right and just the department's unblemished record in failing to hire a woman teacher and said that history was so competitive and difficult a field that married women could never catch up after taking time out to have a baby. He did not seem to entertain the idea that even single women could conceivably be historians.

My initial letter requesting an application and information on a Ph.D. program was responded to with a letter stating that they did not admit many women and no application was sent to me.

French faculty members have consistently failed to encourage women because of an overabundance of women in the department due to a sexist fallacy: French is for sissies, Spanish for jocks and German for real men, a bias perpetuated by the high school counselors. Therefore, men get over encouragement (especially in terms of financial aid) to pursue French. Women are regarded as "sensitive" to literature, but stupid; men as rational and bright. Professors tend to shrug off female comments in their courses and actively seek male classroom participation. With regards to certain senior professors, an *A* for a woman is easily obtainable by (1) the baking of cookies; (2) preparing francophile meals (haute cuisine) (The profs can starve for all I care. I can't afford to feed them — psychologically or financially); and (3) the after-seminar drink. The cookie-cocktail-quiche lorraine *A* is virtually worthless in terms of professional advancement. Professional futures in academia are scarce enough; for a woman in French literature it is almost hopeless.

Older students who attempted to combine their role as student with being a wife and mother told of yet another form of discrimination.

In my department there is discrimination against married women as opposed to single 'career' girls, and particularly against married women with children. It is considered a deadly sign of unprofessionalism to have a family if one is female. Whether one is planning to get married or have children is always asked and taken into account upon application for financial support.

When I was considering going on for a graduate degree, my adviser informed me that my age and sex were against me. He said I would have to have a much better grade point average than a male fifteen years younger than I. Besides, as he put it, I didn't have as many years to give the profession.

> So far as I personally am concerned, I think *age* has been the major area of discrimination, although being a female has not helped. Years of being a mother and housewife don't count as 'job experience.' Since I don't wear blue jeans, a freaky shirt, sweatband, and drink and smoke heavily, I simply wouldn't have 'fit in' with the student image in several departments.

> When I applied to graduate school, I almost didn't get in, despite my satisfactory grade point average, GRE scores and recommendations — because I was told that the department did not want to accept part-time students. I call it discrimination because husbands are supported by wives. Financial aid is not available for part-time students (most of whom are women) who are unable to tackle a twenty-hour a week teaching assistant assignment, coursework, and a house full of kids.

> The most painful assumption that I've encountered is this: How can a thirty-five year old suburban housewife do anything worth taking seriously? This comes as much from male and female students as from faculty members. Every new semester I get those vibrations and feel, unfortunately, terrible internal pressure to *prove* myself.

Married women with children told of the multiple burdens they carried and the barriers they encountered:

> My, what a lovely world it would be if I could get up in the morning and have breakfast made, go to school all day, come home and have the house in order and kids' needs met — dinner on the table, and so on. That nice neat world most of our married male counterparts experience.

> It is extremely difficult to adequately care for the children, work and go to school. One case of chickenpox can goof up a week or more of classes. Babysitting expenses are prohibitive. One must learn to study efficiently in very short periods — between interruptions. The expense of tuition hardly needs comment. For these reasons, I doubt I will have the motivation to get through prelims and dissertation.

> Since I've been in Eagle Heights, I've encouraged three other 'mamas' to give up macrame and go back to school. Eagle Heights is a seedbed for potential women graduate students, but lack of money and scoffing at part-time work by faculty, and husbands, too, defeat many before they even begin.

> The University should adjust its policies so that it is possible for both men and women to attend school part-time with financial aid for *both*. This would enable the couple to share child care and household tasks and help put women on an equal footing with men. I attribute my lack of motivation to my despair at matching the pace and performance of other students whose only responsibility is the achievement of an academic goal. Free child care facilities should be available to supplement home care for children with both parents in school.

> It is difficult for a married woman with children to be taken seriously in my department. Since my marriage is only somewhat liberated the bulk of child care falls on me, with the result that my career has slowed down considerably. This is interpreted by the department as lack of interest, ability, concentration and motivation.

Women in the medical school reported a double standard in admissions policy. Married women applicants were required to undergo two interviews with two different members of the admissions committee. No such interviews were required of married male applicants. In addition, the committee also insisted upon asking the husbands of female applicants about the stability of their marriage and if husbands fully approved of their wives going to medical school. Another woman described a classroom incident not atypical in an almost totally male fraternity of M.D.'s:

> In the middle of a lecture on neonate health ratings, a professor interjected a slide of a nude stripper to 'wake you fellows up.' When the women in the class objected, he told them that if that bothered them, they shouldn't be there.

Another problem frequently commented on was the lack of female role models in all but the traditional women's fields. As one woman remarked, "How helpful it would be to see someone 'like you' in the position or career you are striving for." Another woman described hiring practices and attitudes guaranteed to maintain the purity of an all male department:

> Out of forty-seven plus faculty members in chemistry, not one is a woman. They have not even seriously interviewed one in the past 16 years, which is as far back as I can trace. They do not even seem to be concerned about it, even though the department is dependent upon federal funds. The chancellor's letter of last spring urging hiring of women was handed to me as a joke by a male faculty member with the comment: "We don't hire women because we write our faculty friends at other universities to suggest people for positions — and they never send us women's names because none of them are any good. Ha-Ha."

In coming to the end of recording the kinds of discrimination experienced by UW-Madison women graduate students, we are reminded of where we began, which was with an inquiry into the question of why women drop out. The attrition rate for women nationally has remained higher than for men since the early 1950s. Ann Sutherland Harris sought to account for this fact by reference to factors other than marriage and family. She found broad implications in the studies done by Rosenthal and Jacobson that demonstrated the extent to which teachers' or experimenters' expectations of subjects' success are likely to predestine that success — what has come to be known as the self-fulfilling prophecy.[2] That is, as others' attitudes are internalized, they become as one's own. In the same way, the belief by some professors that women will drop out before completing an advanced degree may become a self-fulfilling prophecy. Professors' attitudes and women's responses to them are both revealed in the following comments.

> My adviser does not feel women are as competent as men apparently. He especially feels women should not marry if they intend to pursue a Ph.D. because they will drop out, never work in the field, and waste the time and money invested in them by the university.

> Some male professors feel that a woman will drop out of graduate school so it isn't worth the effort to take them into their research. I am seriously considering dropping out now because I am not particularly interested in doing research any more.

> Many professors don't take women seriously, but several I've talked to about this justify their attitude on the basis of their experience: Women rarely finish the dissertation because of a lack of real interest in research — which may be true — and very few women actually 'amount' to anything as scholars.

> After I became a mother, my chairman took it upon himself to cut my teaching load. He did not ask me whether or not I could cope with a normal academic load. I called him up and informed him that he had made a decision based on false assumptions (that the care of the infant is exclusively the wife's responsibility) and he reversed the decision. I was, of course, lucky. Similar decisions are made 'for' women all the time.

> The impression a woman gets is that becoming a mathematician is an 'extra' in her life, whereas for a man it is central; hence her major professor is likely not to feel as much responsibility for helping her finish as he does for helping his male students finish. This can result in her research pace slowing down, and, if too much momentum is lost — stopping entirely. Then her professors tell themselves she just wasn't interested or determined enough.

Professors, assuming that women are not serious students, that they are there as pleasant decorations to grace the campus, to lighten a young man's heart, and perhaps to find husbands for themselves, have actively and subtly discouraged women from beginning, continuing, or completing graduate work. Without adequate encouragement, support, counseling, financial aid, and female role models, many women do indeed become disillusioned and discouraged and many consider the possibility of dropping out. Thus a vicious cycle is created. One woman summed it up very nicely: "If a male decides to drop out of graduate school, he does not become the same sort of statistic as does a female who may do likewise. She becomes part of that statistic of women following their natural instincts, and thus a good reason not to admit them next time because women will just follow this instinct and in the end demonstrate just what bad 'investments' (after all, the university is a business) they really are. No one ever stops to think just what a self-fulfilling prophecy this all becomes."

Since the crisis year for women of 1971-72, things have changed on the campus. Overt kinds of discrimination in admissions practices, the awarding of financial assistance, in hiring practices and in salaries have been mostly eliminated. Title IX and other government and executive orders have been enacted which specifically prohibit discrimination against students and university employees on the basis of sex. Some professors have cleaned up their acts: they studiously avoid sexist jokes and comments and have taken the nude girlie pictures out of their lectures. In 1974, a University of Wisconsin System "Policy on Equal Opportunities in Education" was adopted, requiring each institution to make a yearly report to the president summarizing the results of efforts to identify and eliminate any existing discriminatory practices. After a long struggle between the administration and women's groups, an affirmative action policy has also been adopted.

Years of treating women like barely-tolerated foreigners have faded to an era where women are treated like "data bits" to be carefully counted and duly recorded for federally-mandated institutional reports. But the numbers reflect some dramatic changes. The number of women entering college and graduate and professional schools has increased so sharply over the past few years that women now constitute about half of the first-year enrollment in most institutions. A nationwide survey by the U.S. Census Bureau in 1975 found that the enrollment of women in graduate and professional schools rose about 75 percent between 1970 and 1975, while for men the five-year increase was only 23 percent. After the first year, however, their numbers declined. Only 33 percent of the second-year, third-year, and fourth-year graduate and professional students were women. Women received 21 percent of the doctoral degrees (up 59 percent), and 12.5 percent (up 184 percent) of the first professional degrees.[3]

Statistics for UW-Madison women students reflect the national pattern. While the number and percentage of women master's degree recipients have only increased slightly, the percentage of Ph.D. degrees received has gone from 12 percent in 1970-71 to 20 percent in 1975-76, law degrees from 7 percent to 24 percent, and medicine from 8 percent to 18 percent.

Progress in the more subtle area of attitudes is difficult to judge. Women students still report an uncongenial climate in many departments, a grudging acceptance of their presence, an implication that they are there only because the school or department was "forced" to accept more women. Such complaints, when reported in isolation, may seem trivial or nit-picking. But when considered with the survey responses of five years ago, such incidents point to the continuing existence of a pattern of attitudes about women that cannot be eradicated simply by adding a token female faculty member and admitting a few more women students. If we want to keep women students from dropping out, if we want to help women achieve their full potential and assume their rightful place in society, then we must take the blinders off faculty members who fail to see that a problem exists. Clearly it is these faculty members, male and female alike, who must understand and become sensitive to the problems women students face.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 5

1. Ruth Bleier, "Women and the Wisconsin Experience," *College English*, 34 (October 1972), p. 102.
2. Quoted in Karen Merritt, "Women and Higher Education: Voices from the Sexual Siberia," in *Beyond Intellectual Sexism, A New Woman, A New Reality*, edited by Joan I. Roberts, (New York: David McKay Company, 1976), p. 360.
3. "The Chronicle of Higher Education," February 7, 1977, Vol. XIII, Number 21.

Women's Athletics
UW-Madison

PART TWO

THE NEW CONCERNS

6. A Women's Studies Plan for Wisconsin

A New Approach to Curriculum Planning

by Karen Merritt

Arising from a thriving political consciousness, a new discipline began to take shape in the early 1970s. In its struggle against crippling societal stereotypes, the feminist movement of the late 1960s and 70s encountered huge gaps in our knowledge of what female nature and behavior actually were. Research in the sciences and social sciences was based consistently on a male norm; so-called truths about human behavior were in fact observations of male behavior. In many crucial areas of inquiry, the study of women had not taken place at all. In the arts and humanities as well, biases within the disciplines favored male values and accomplishments. At the same time, the scope of the historical contributions of women and their literary and artistic accomplishments had not been addressed.

The inadequacies of the curriculum perceived by the feminist movement led to the creation of a new field of study now commonly called women's studies. In this it paralleled the development of Afro-American studies, which also grew out of a political movement and sought to overcome deficiencies in established disciplines. Women's studies was from the beginning an interdisciplinary field.

Among the pioneers of the women's studies movement were several Wisconsin university women. Most often from the junior faculty and frequently from English departments, they offered the first women's studies course on their campus, under a variable content course number and entitled "Images of Women in Literature."

The first interdisciplinary women's studies course in the University of Wisconsin was offered by a coalition of students and faculty from UW-Madison and UW-Extension and appeared in contemporary trends, a series of current issue oriented variable content courses for undergraduates. One of the earliest women's studies courses in a departmental setting was developed in the school of education at UW-Madison. In part to demonstrate the quality of research about women being done by women in a cross section of disciplines, Professor Joan Roberts in the department of educational policy studies developed a new course, "Women in Education," for which she invited women on the faculty and staff to discuss the study of women in their fields. Throughout the University of Wisconsin and Wisconsin State Universities, the new field of women's studies was introduced by means of innovative courses.

Other early steps to foster women's studies reflected a variety of views of what was to be done and how to do it. Women faculty at UW-Whitewater who were members of the Midwest Modern Language Association played a crucial part in creation and leadership of the women's caucus within the MMLA. At UW-Oshkosh, a faculty committee developed and wrote a proposal for a minor in women's studies, the first curricular planning document of this nature in the public universities of Wisconsin. When the minor was approved, it was also a first. The approach at UW-Milwaukee was to seek new funding for a women's studies administrator and office which would offer leadership in supportive services, course planning and coordination of women's studies programming. UW-Milwaukee was successful in its bid for new funds to support a half-time coordinator of women's studies, half-time specialist, and secretarial help. This became the first budget specifically devoted to women's studies in the UW System.

The major change wrought on public higher education in Wisconsin during the early 1970s, the merger of the University of Wisconsin with the Wisconsin State Universities to establish the University of Wisconsin System, became the context for what would be the first full-scale statewide women's studies planning endeavor of its sort in the country. Early in his tenure, Senior Vice President Donald K. Smith identified a group of specific curricular areas which would benefit from a planning effort that had as its focus the interests of the UW System as a whole. Faculty representatives from each UW institution which would be affected by the outcomes of the studies were selected to participate on system-wide task forces. Three well-established professional disciplines — agriculture, business and engineering — were the subjects of this task force planning approach. In addition, task forces were created to study two significant emerging disciplines. One was a group of fields of study called collectively American ethnic studies; the other was women's studies. Because planning in ethnic studies and women's studies had the potential to affect all of the UW System's fifteen institutions, each campus was represented by a member on each task force.[1]

In his letter of charge to the task force on women's studies, Smith laid out a request for guidance for the UW System as a whole in women's studies program development. He asked two questions in particular: how many programs of what nature should the UW System support, and where should they be located.

At the first meeting of the task force, the members elected Barbara Desmarais, an assistant professor of English at UW-Whitewater and one of the leaders of the women's studies movement in Wisconsin, to be chair. Committee membership ranged from individuals who were activists knowledgeable about women's studies to those to whom women's studies was a new issue. All but two task force members were women and the large majority were faculty members. Very early in the history of the task force, the members began to assume the role of advocates of women's studies on their home campuses.

The first task force meetings in early 1974 focused on information gathering. Task force members canvassed system campuses to learn the extent of current activities in women's studies. They researched the literature and corresponded with colleges around the United States that had programs underway. They held open hearings on the UW-Extension educational telephone network to discuss with all interested faculty and students in the system what a women's studies program ought to be, how it should be organized, and what problems would need to be overcome in establishing programs. At the same time the task force began discussions of basic issues: the philosophy of the women's studies program, the best academic structure to achieve program ends, administration and financing of women's studies, and research and program support services.

A first draft report was completed in the spring of 1974 and was circulated for reaction and comment throughout the UW System. Several individuals responded and the Wisconsin Coordinating Council of Women in Higher Education prepared a thorough critique with recommendations for changes. The task force held its final meeting in the fall of 1974 to analyze the commentaries received, to incorporate changes as the need was perceived, and to prepare the final report. Central administration presented the final report of the task force to the Board of Regents and UW chancellors on October 25, 1974.

In the course of deliberations, task force members had thought and talked at length about the serious problem faced throughout the system by faculty and students interested in introducing women's studies: a substantial number of faculty and administrators assumed a negative attitude toward women's studies. Though any new curricular concept could be expected to face the inertia of a traditionally conservative faculty, the field of women's studies was subjected to the additional handicaps of institutional suspicion about the feminist movement from which it sprang, and the association in the minds of many faculty with the separatist strain in the founding of Afro-American studies programs and departments. Questions which task force members encountered again and again on their campuses reflected the widespread ignorance of what women's studies was: "Don't we need to have men's studies if we have women's studies?" "Will you allow men into women's studies courses?" "Isn't women's studies just a fad?"

Another special difficulty which women's studies would face was that traditionally shared by interdisciplinary programs: second class citizenship in terms of prestige, protection of faculty career progress, budget and other types of institutional support. It was in recommendations addressing the problems of women's studies as an interdisciplinary field that the task force proposed options potentially of use to other developing and innovative curricula.

The major conclusion reached by the task force in addressing the specific questions posed by Smith (how many women's studies programs and on which campuses should they be located) was that in its function as a corrective to the incomplete and incorrect information in the traditional disciplines, women's studies programming was needed at every degree-granting institution in the UW System.[3] Mindful of their roles as faculty and institutional representatives the task force members insisted that the principle of campus autonomy in curricular affairs be preserved in their recommendations. Consequently, the task force created a group of program alternatives, one of which any degree-granting institution in the system could be expected to adopt in light of local resources and unit-specific educational mission. The three program options were: an interdisciplinary course sequence which would be specially noted on the student's transcript or recognized by a special certificate, an interdisciplinary minor, or an interdisciplinary major to be taken in conjunction with an established major. The philosophy of the task force that women's studies should not become isolated but should instead have an ongoing impact in improving course content in the established disciplines is reflected in these program recommendations, particularly in the third.

To develop and give leadership to women's studies programming, the task force advised that a coordinator with faculty status be appointed with released administrative time commensurate with the size of the institution and with teaching responsibility, preferably in women's studies. The task force voiced its concern that the promotional advancement of the coordinator be protected. Particularly at the outset of the program, the task force felt it was advisable to appoint a tenured faculty member to the position. The administrative unit recommended to plan and oversee women's studies was an interdisciplinary committee composed of teachers of women's studies courses, representatives of the schools and colleges on campus, students, and the affirmative action officer in an *ex officio* capacity. The task force advised that there not be departments of women's studies, but instead that the interdisciplinary committee have department-like functions and the coordinator, the status of a department chair.

The importance of research in women's studies led the task force to urge that a research center to service all the UW System be founded. Related to this necessity was the question of identifying and acquiring library resources to support research and course work, an especially complex problem when the field is interdisciplinary. A proposal developed by a group of librarians at UW-Madison and UW-Milwaukee for a UW System librarian-at-large, a professional librarian and information officer who would serve all UW campuses, was incorporated into the final report.

The vital issue of budgetary support became the subject of the final lengthy section of recommendations. By 1974, the UW System had experienced a series of crushing fiscal cutbacks and the catchword "austerity" seemed liable to become a permanent characterization of the future. Nevertheless, the task force insisted that full fiscal support was imperative for program development; the old expectation of volunteerism among women should not under any circumstances become the basis for program development in women's studies.

The final report was widely distributed to chief administrators in the UW System, deans, faculty leaders, interested faculty and other interested individuals. The initiative to carry out the planning steps recommended by the task force now lay with the campuses.

As seemed probable when the final report was completed, the budgetary situation in the UW System did not improve. It became increasingly evident that new program money was no longer available. The request of the Board of Regents for funding to support the system-oriented research center and librarian-at-large in women's studies plus some modest program start-up funding was refused by state government.

Nevertheless, in the face of extraordinary difficulties, the majority of the system's thirteen four-year institutions established coordinator positions (ten by 1976) and committees (eleven by 1976) within the first two years of distribution of the final report. Two new minors and a course sequence which leads to a special certificate had been instituted, and planning for two additional minors was well advanced. Though the released time allowed coordinators for administrative duties and budgetary support fell short of the standard set by the task force in all but a very few cases, the level of funding achieved on most campuses, given the heavy competition for reallocated resources, was nothing less than remarkable. In part, the achievement has illustrated the growing sophistication of female faculty in understanding and taking advantage of the mechanisms by which new programs are approved and funded.

Too, a few faculty have been successful in winning extramural funds in partial support of their programs.

Women's studies committees have generally developed according to the model recommended by the task force. They are interdisciplinary and include faculty teaching women's studies, school/college representatives, and students.

In the spring of 1976, a conference for the UW System was held in Madison with a dual purpose: to stimulate the development of women's studies library resources and to offer a setting in which women's studies faculty, students and interested librarians could meet one another and exchange information on what they had been doing in their programs, classrooms and libraries. A total of 150 participants attended the two-day event.

By the summer of 1977, women's studies minors had been approved at UW-Oshkosh, UW-Stevens Point, UW-Whitewater, UW-Superior and UW-Stout. At UW-Platteville, a women's studies course sequence to be recognized by a special certificate was approved as well. Programs were well underway at UW-Green Bay, UW-Milwaukee and UW-Madison.

The most recent accomplishment in women's studies development has been the reallocation of central administration resources to fund the UW System librarian-at-large position for a two-year pilot period. At the end of that time, it is hoped that the librarian can be located in the system research center advocated by the task force. Though unfunded, the research center concept remains vital and a possible first step toward its creation may be represented in the Wisconsin women artists archive project currently in progress under the auspices of the urban corridor consortium.[3]

The path to establishing new women's studies programs has in the past been extremely difficult; to maintain them will continue to be a struggle in the foreseeable future. The programs which are now in operation face the difficulty common to all interdisciplinary curricula in a discipline-based setting: successfully securing the funding base and faculty time necessary to staff required courses. To a large degree, their survival depends on their ability to attract substantial numbers of students. To date, those programs which have several semesters of experience can point to strong growth patterns; they are clearly providing an option which students want and need. However, as the number of traditional-aged college students drops in Wisconsin, as it appears will be the case for the next fifteen years, the newest programs will be the most susceptible to cuts. Their survival will depend on the degree to which the disciplines assume the responsibility to provide courses and units in courses which focus on the half of the human population which has been neglected by the academy to date — and on the continued energy and dedication of faculty who believe that the field of women's studies is essential to the intellectual life and vigor of the university.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 6

1 At the recommendation of the Wisconsin Coordinating Council of Women in Higher Education, a student member was subsequently added. Negotiations to add a coordinating council representative were unsuccessful.

2 Though the distinctions were not precisely drawn, task force recommendations did not specifically address the special situations of the two-year centers or statewide Extension. The general statements on the need for women's studies, however, were directed to all segments of the UW System.

3 Consortium members include UW-Green Bay, which is giving guidance to the research project, UW-Milwaukee, UW-Oshkosh and UW-Parkside.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Final Report of System Task Force on Women's Studies. University of Wisconsin System, 1974.

Women's Studies Development in the University of Wisconsin System 1974-75. Office of Academic Affairs, UW-Central Administration, August 1975.

Women's Studies Development in the University of Wisconsin System 1975-76. Office of Academic Affairs, UW-Central Administration, November 1976.

Women's Studies Development in the University of Wisconsin System, Annual Report (Final). Office of Academic Affairs, UW-Central Administration, October, 1977.

CC

7. The Women's Studies Program — Milwaukee

by Rachel I. Skalitzky

The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee was the first unit within the University of Wisconsin System to establish an office of women's studies in February, 1974. The events leading to the establishment of the office resulted from two major efforts.

Formal communication at UW-Milwaukee about women's studies was initiated with the gathering and publication of data in 1971-72 by Lenore Harmon (advisor to the chancellor on the status of women) and subsequently in 1973-74 by Leila Fraser (assistant to the vice chancellor for affirmative action). In the fall of 1971, Professor Harmon, along with a few students and professors, attended a midwest conference on women's studies at Alverno College. The immediate result of this conference was a poll taken of faculty interest in women's studies and the possible women's studies content of courses to be offered in the spring of 1972. A mimeographed list of this data was distributed to interested faculty and students. No list was gathered for the summer of 1972, but beginning in the fall of 1972 and continuing to the present, a list of women's studies courses has appeared in the schedule of classes. These lists have facilitated communication about women's studies on campus and encouraged departments and instructors to offer women's studies courses.

The second major effort at UW-Milwaukee which laid the groundwork for the office of women's studies was the work of the women's studies subcommittee of the ad hoc committee on the status of academic women. This active faculty-student subcommittee, co-chaired by Edith Bjorklund (head of acquisitions, UW-M library) and Angela Peckenpaugh (assistant professor of English), was organized in December, 1971. It collected information in Wisconsin and elsewhere about women's studies programs, urged curriculum development and library collection, gathered a central name file of interested people at UW-Milwaukee, and held open meetings on campus about women's studies. A formal proposal was drafted; it included recommendations for a UW-Milwaukee women's studies program, located in a central office, which would be an information clearinghouse, encourage course development and research on women's experience, and sponsor public service activities.

Much credit for the immediate establishment of the office of women's studies is due to Vice Chancellor William L. Walters. Convinced of the academic necessity of such a program, Dr. Walters worked with Dr. Leila Fraser in spring of 1973 to incorporate a women's studies office into the 1973-75 biennial budget. This office became a reality, as a separate budget item under the division of academic affairs of the vice chancellor, in February of 1974.

Dr. Lenore Harmon was appointed the first coordinator of women's studies (1/2 time position). After one and one-half years Harmon resigned to return to full-time teaching and research. Dr. Rachel I. Skalitzky (assistant professor of comparative literature) was appointed to succeed Harmon as

C7

coordinator in October, 1975. An advisory committee, comprising representatives of various schools and colleges, student groups and administrators acts as an advisory body to the office.

Under Harmon's leadership the women's studies program was founded on firm and appropriate academic principles. She stated that the philosophy of the women's studies office was "to encourage women's studies teaching and research in established departments and by individual professors." She envisaged the ultimate goal of the program to be the increase in scholarly knowledge relevant to women and academic experiences relevant to women students. With a reaffirmation of these goals, the office has grown and flourished under Skalitzky.

The four chief functions of the office of women's studies during the past three and one-half years have been: (1) cross-listing women's studies courses offered at UW-Milwaukee; (2) promoting research on women's experience; (3) providing information about women and women's studies to students, university employees, and community members; and (4) sponsoring educational programs which contain women's studies content.

The first of these functions, the cross-listing of women's studies courses, includes the identification of existing courses and the encouragement of new course development.

In a cross-listing procedure developed by the women's studies advisory council, department chairpersons suggest courses for cross-listing and faculty members must submit an outline, bibliography and vita. In addition, the instructor must agree to have the course evaluated by the office of women's studies using an evaluation form prepared by the advisory council.

In general, thirteen to fifteen courses with 100 percent women's studies content are now offered in the fall and spring semesters and about five courses in the summer session. The enrollment for the three semesters is about 1,200 students. The majority of the courses is offered in the college of letters and science, with the others in the school of education, the school of fine arts, and the school of nursing. All of these courses remain department-based and funded. The office continues its efforts to: (1) encourage colleges to develop recurring sequences of women's studies courses at all levels of study which will make it possible for students to plan ahead; and (2) encourage departments to develop interdepartmental courses as part of the above sequences. Two interdisciplinary courses, "Contemporary Trends: New Feminism, New Masculinism" and "Freshman Seminar: Perspectives on Women," were taught during 1974-75, but neither was a continuing course.

The office continues to poll faculty about courses which contain a limited amount of material pertaining to women's studies. A list of these "related" courses is available in the office and is posted on bulletin boards. A similar list of faculty available for directing independent reading in women's studies is made available to the public. Beginning in the fall of 1977 faculty members who perform either or both of the above services will be listed as affiliated faculty; those who teach courses with 100 percent women's studies content will be designated program faculty.

Since 1971 an undergraduate major in women's studies has been available in the college of letters and science through its committee interdisciplinary major. Interest has grown in this major, and seven students have now elected it.

While six schools at UW-Milwaukee have not offered 100 percent women's studies content courses, some of the faculty have taught related courses and directed independent reading. The office is in contact with these schools through their representatives on the advisory council and through other activities, such as co-sponsoring lectures and supplying faculty with research information about women and particular disciplines. It remains a goal of the office to work toward increased participation of these schools in the program, wherever this involvement is feasible.

The second major function of the office, promoting research on women's experience, has been performed in a number of ways. There is a continuing effort to identify current campus research in the area of women's studies through an annual poll of faculty research interests. By the office's publication of this information (now in an annual supplement to *Women's Studies News*), researchers are put in contact with others of similar interest. Public lectures on this research have been sponsored through the women's studies section of the graduate school faculty seminar series and through the lunch seminar series. As part of the information function of the office, the staff monitors recent publications and informs faculty members of materials related to their research interests.

A greater commitment to women's studies research has been envisioned but not yet realized on the UW-Milwaukee campus. During 1974-75, Harmon submitted a proposal for a $90,000 system-wide women's studies research center to be developed at UW-Milwaukee; this proposal was approved by the regents but was not included in the 1975-77 state budget. During 1976-77 Skalitzky submitted a design of the research center proposal revised to $47,000 for inclusion in the 1977-79 budget; the proposal was aborted at the campus level.

Vice Chancellor Walters has channeled $12,000 from contingency funds into the women's studies budget for 1977-78 to support a post-doctoral fellowship in women's studies political science. The fellowship has been awarded to Dr. Susan Gluck Mezey, who will be directed by UW-Milwaukee senior researcher Professor Beverly Cook of the political science department. Future research grants will be written to obtain funding for an annual post-doctoral fellowship program in women's studies.

A third function of the office of women's studies is the provision of information relative to women's studies to students, university employees and community members. The office has acquired necessary resource information such as course outlines, bibliographies, periodical publications, government documents, conference reports, and other pamphlet-length material. The resource area of the office includes directories of local and national women's organizations and their leadership, information about grants and financial assistance, and UW-Milwaukee program information, including a speakers list. Staff members daily answer numerous questions about campus and community events and make referrals to other agencies of particular value to women.

In carrying out its fourth function, sponsoring educational programs which contain women's studies content, the office has served thousands of people during its three and one-half years of operation. The first advisory council established a policy favoring co-sponsorship of events. With this in mind, the office co-sponsored "Women Teaching Women" with the Milwaukee chapter of Wisconsin Women in the Arts, "A Week with French Women" with the center for twentieth century studies, and the correspondents readers' theatre with the UW-Milwaukee feminist center and Women's Soul Publishing. The office co-sponsored a women's studies essay contest with the Wisconsin Coordinating Council of Women in Higher Education, and worked with campus women to plan a women in science career workshop, which was funded by the National Science Foundation. In addition, prominent speakers, such as June Sochen, Diane Owen Hughes, Elizabeth Janeway, and Jean Fox O'Barr, have been brought to campus through cooperative arrangements with campus departments and programs.

Major planning and fiscal responsibility were taken for a four-day women's film festival and a three-day program in conjunction with the nationally travelling exhibit entitled "Remember the Ladies." The latter program was funded by a grant received from the Wisconsin humanities committee. Two campus lecture series have been established by the office: the lunch seminar series with topics of particular interest to women's studies majors and students; and the administrative leadership series for encouraging faculty women to consider, plan and train for top administrative positions.

The office has worked successfully to increase the number of women elected to university committees, to sponsor women's studies faculty for outstanding teaching awards (Ethel Sloane, 1976; Sharon Murphy, 1977), and to have a woman, Marya Saturenska Gregory, receive an honorary degree at commencement in 1977. The coordinator chaired the chancellor's special task force on grievance procedures and Title IX in 1976-77, which made recommendations to ensure proper university grievance procedures for alleged sex discrimination.

Greater involvement with other programs in the University of Wisconsin System was gained through the system women's studies conference held in Madison in April-May, 1976. One significant outcome of the conference was the establishment of projects sponsored on a consortial basis. The Milwaukee office assumed administrative leadership in facilitating the urban corridor consortium women's studies project I: special collection of Wisconsin women artists. This collection of taped oral-history interviews with Wisconsin artists has begun as a pilot project at Green Bay and Milwaukee; the collection will be housed in the UW-Milwaukee archives. Funding for personnel and library archival storage equipment has been sought from the National Endowment for the Humanities.

The future of the women's studies program is substantially promising in view of its growth since its establishment in February of 1974. This growth has been nurtured by the help and encouragement of Vice Chancellor Walters and by the support of numerous university employees and students. Future plans for the program include a continuing emphasis on the major functions of the office: teaching and research on women's experience. The structuring of the program will continue to accommodate the existing and growing needs and plans of students, as opposed to setting up a programmatic superstructure with the expectation that students will accommodate to it. In the area of research, a major effort will be made to obtain funding for a post-doctoral fellowship program. Sponsored events in the near future include an emphasis on women and political science/law; and a special program, for which a grant proposal has been submitted to the Wisconsin humanities committee, highlighting the political and cultural concerns of minority women in Wisconsin.

8. Sedition in a Sexist Society

The Platteville Paradigm

by Barbara Parsons

The specific events I am about to speak of occurred in 1975-76 at the site of the first normal school in Wisconsin. The events, I am convinced, give us a picture of a situation in which the new realities of women are still being resisted. On the assumption that the human condition is such that we cannot grow in any significant way except through some painful recognition of our capacity to accept and promote inverted values, I write this essay. I dedicate it to all the students I have known but in particular to those students who, often despite their "educations," have somehow managed to reject every major violence against the human spirit.

Violence: A Definition

Before moving to the heart of this essay, I believe it important to clarify the meaning of a term I have now used. The term is "violence." By it I mean not the easily recognized kind involving the use of physical force to do visible injury to persons but, rather, the easily ignored kind involving the perverted exertion of power that primarily works its havoc psychologically and spiritually. This latter, covert violence, unlike its easily recognized bastard sibling, is almost always legitimized by institutions, structures or habits of society.

From the Beginning . . .

At the beginning of this century in Platteville, Wisconsin, the age-old relationship between women and men was repeated, reinforced, and perpetuated in what upon its establishment in 1907 was named the Wisconsin Mining Trade School. Called eventually (1915) the Wisconsin Mining School and still later (1939) the Wisconsin Institute of Technology, it was merged in 1959 with the then nearly century-old Platteville Normal School.

Of the new couple, designated the Wisconsin State College and Institute of Technology, it was clear from the outset that the younger of the two had, in the words of an historian writing in 1966, "an especially strong and vital *esprit de corps* that could not be denied."[1] In an attempt to identify the source and nature of this esprit de corps, the same historian went on to say:

> In one respect, admiration for and respect for the combination of technical proficiency and success in the business world was completely in tune with the prevailing middle class attitudes of most Americans from the time of the founding of the mining school in 1907. By teaching and by example, the mining school student could see immediately tangible benefits in his work. At the same time, by virtue of the nature of the work and by the make up of the student body, certain qualities of masculinity were built into the program. Even when a girl was occasionally enrolled at the mining school, the main force of activity and progression still remained masculine.[2]

The author of the passage offered no definition of masculine or qualities of masculinity. Perhaps he considered the meaning of such terms self-evident.

Even the fact that he neglected to mention in his statement the exclusively male make-up of the mining school's faculty perhaps supports the idea that he thought that that could be taken for granted. Likewise he apparently saw no reason to insert the qualifying word male between most and Americans in his specification of respect for "technical proficiency and success in the business world" as being "in tune with the prevailing middle class attitudes" since 1907. Nevertheless, the fact that for most of the decades since then, women have generally neither aspired to nor expected to achieve such proficiency and success and that men have generally found this state of affairs perfectly appropriate or feminine may tell us as much as anything about a good part of the esprit de corps, and hence the masculine character of the mining school where, one suspects, any girl who enrolled might have learned the meaning of alien.

One wonders, in any case, how the same girl may have responded to that aspect of *The Geode*, a magazine founded by the mining school in 1925, ignored by our historian when he identified the publication as one whose "contents were largely technical presentations of contemporary practices in mining and civil engineering projects."[3] Omitted from this description was reference to the crude jokes which regularly appeared (and continue to appear) in *The Geode* about women.

While an esprit de corps can thrive on almost any combination of sense and nonsense, it is not surprising that the masculine one of what was to become Platteville's college of engineering provided a heritage of sexism which to the extent that it was apparently so unconscious became so natural and clearly such fun to the males of each new class of students, a good number of whom as alumni returned to the school to become members of the faculty. It is furthermore not surprising that this old boys' club with a vengeance has continued to nurture an image of women defined by boys for boys (*The Geode* now, for instance, perhaps in recognition of the forty or so women among the six to seven hundred engineering students, regularly runs a pictorial spread on a coed called "our Geode gem of the month," which gem is at times, among other poses, shown reclining on a bed). As William James has remarked, in matters of belief, "we are all extreme conservatives;" the influence of our old truths, truths we have become comfortable with, is absolutely controlling so that, he goes on to say, "by far the most usual way of handling phenomena so novel that they would make for a serious rearrrangement of our preconception is to ignore them altogether, or to abuse those who bear witness for them."[4]

"An Old Saying"

There is perhaps no better way of seeing Platteville as a microcosmic example of what, for James, is characteristic of the human macrocosm than by considering two related events which led to considerable furor on campus and which originated in the traditional expression of what may be taken as part of the traditional esprit de corps of Platteville's mining engineering students. Both events began with a float sponsored by the Platteville chapter of the American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineering — AIME — in UW-Platteville's homecoming parade, which annually attracts a throng to watch it drive and march and play its way down Main Street.

The parade of October, 1975 included at least one brand new feature. That was Platteville's brand new chancellor, Warren Carrier, who had arrived on campus just a few months earlier, carrying with him the recommendation that he had helped start the first women's studies program in the country when he had been a dean in California. But while some of the twenty or so faculty women and even some of the one hundred and fifty plus faculty men might have considered this part of the new chancellor's past a sign of a possible good in Platteville's future, a careful look at some of the entries in the homecoming parade was enough to recall us to a real perversion in Platteville's present.

Among the entries, for example, was the traditional one of the veteran's club, a battered, open car driven and ridden by drinking ex-members of the world's finest and painted all over with sexist vulgarities one could expect to find in an army barracks' "can." By comparison, the AIME float, coming in the form of an outhouse and bearing as its major inscription "an old saying" of miners (as one female student later defendingly described it) could be considered clean, presentable, surely nothing to be concerned about.

But precisely because it was predictable and could be considered harmless and humorous by some women and most men, the old saying — and the insidious, because acceptable, sexism underlying it — had to be challenged.

The old saying was "keep your women barefoot, pregnant, and out of the mine," and the challenge to it was twofold in the form of two letters. One, written by women students and non-students in the community, was addressed to both the dean of students and the student newspaper and called for the university to "take appropriate action." The other, written by myself and published at the same time in the newspaper, read as follows:

> Dear Editor:
> Given the general euphoria displayed in last week's *Exponent* concerning homecoming two weeks ago, perhaps it would be well to consider one seamy side of the occasion lest we suffer the illusion that the event was an unmitigated success. The seamy side I refer to is the engineering students' outhouse float, which traveled not once, not twice, but three times down the length of Main Street, bearing the inspiring message: "keep your women barefoot and pregnant."
>
> As some of us watched the float, we wondered what would have happened if the message had read, "keep your blacks shufflin' and saying, 'yassuh'." Such a statement, we figure, would probably have entailed a few consequences initiated by some justifiably irate blacks in our community. Hence, it is understandable that the engineering students stuck with a message directed to that part of the population which supposedly would constitute no real danger or threat of relocating some engineers' noses following the parade.
>
> Last spring an engineer here in Wisconsin reported in a newspaper article that he thought "most engineers are not socially responsible." In view of the outhouse message provided in UW-Platteville's homecoming parade, it may be wondered whether this particular engineer's judgment was based on empirical data gathered on our campus.[5]

The letters had their effect. For the next four weeks the newspaper carried responses, sometimes five to six at a time on or about the issue. Most of the letters written by women showed an understanding of what the real issue was. Most of the letters written by men did not. From the letters came expressions of anger, surprise, disgust that so much attention could be given to, as one male student put it, the "trivial topic of a certain homecoming float."[6]

Another male, a student in civil engineering, decided to take a lighthearted approach. "Let me philosophize for awhile," he wrote.

> A couple of *Exponent's* ago Barb Parsons remarked about the mining engineers' float (which has been the same for the last five to six years) in the homecoming parade. As you know, it had the just disgusting slogan "keep your women barefoot and pregnant, and out of the mine." This she thought was just terrible. At that time my wife was pregnant and out of the mine, but not barefoot, thank goodness. It would have been directed right at her . . .
>
> I think Barb Parsons (and some others who wish an apology) should write in to Ultra Brite toothpaste and tell them to get their sex appeal commercials off the air. Or maybe they should apply for the job of being the little old lady. No rehearsals would be needed."[7]

During this October/November, 1975 month of letters, the *Exponent* carried a front page article on a document sent to the chancellor by the campus status of women committee calling for, among other things, the development of a women's studies program and pointing out conditions the committee judged discriminatory against women, including, as the newspaper put it, the problem that women students "find themselves frequently to be captive victims of male professors' insensitive and often blatantly chauvinistic remarks."[8]

This, on top of the already unnerving controversy, was decidedly too much for the termitic intelligence. So out from the woodwork it came. Two male students joined forces to write (with a peculiar disregard for the spelling of "chauvinism"):

> We would like to take this opportunity to inform all interested students of the possible formation of a non affirmative action group, tentatively entitled the status of men committee.
>
> The basic underlying principle is, we think, best stated in our preamble, "all men shall be deemed morally and mentally superior, and all women shall henceforth conduct themselves in a barefoot and pregnant manner."
>
> As one of our major projects we would like to set up a separate men's study department, with an excess of personnel and far too much money. This department could conduct such classes such as male chauvenism 113, advanced male chauvenism 213 and possibly derogatory remarks 413, . . ."[9]

Another male student wrote regarding the status of women committee's request for "a women's center":

> I then propose that one also be set up for us poor, slighted male students and every other legitimate campus organization. Why not one for every race, color and creed, too? And while we're at it let's not forget the birds and squirrels who inhabit this campus and thus represent a significant minority viewpoint. Seriously, I suggest the group use the gold room or any one of the available meeting rooms for their meetings."[10]

In addition to student letters there appeared a letter from a non-student. The non-student was the director of alumni affairs, Paul Ipsen, who in previous months, via the alumni newspaper, had established a solid reputation for himself as a friend of the college of engineering and foe of the local AAUP chapter (of which I was a member) which in the preceding year had had the temerity to question the procedures whereby an expensive new major in mechanical engineering was approved on the campus in the midst of the administration's move to lay off — on the grounds of "financial exigency" — tenured faculty members in the college of arts and sciences. To Mr. Ipsen I

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

had committed the unpardonable sin. What was it? Let the alumni director speak for himself:

> That a group of students used the phrase "keep your women barefoot and pregnant" on their outhouse float in the parade is certainly crass and objectionable, but hardly unforgiveable.
>
> That a professor of philosophy should use the quotation "most engineers are not socially responsible" in a letter meant for publication is beyond belief and certainly unforgiveable, unless the teaching of logic no longer exists in her discipline . . .[11]

The director seemed clearly distraught. Was it because I had violated some taboo against making public at Platteville the fact that not all engineers have Platteville's esprit de corps? On the hunch that the answer was yes, I decided to respond. "With reference to last week's letter from Paul Ipsen," I began . . .

> I am not sure what Mr. Ipsen's field of expertise is, but clearly it seems to be neither logic nor reading comprehension.
>
> If, however, what seems to be the case is not really the case, then the prestidigitation by which Mr. Ipsen suggests that it was I, not an engineer, who publicly asserted that "most engineers are not socially responsible" is something worthy of the propaganda feats of his own erstwhile hero, Richard M. Nixon. . . .[12]

It was the week after this second letter of mine was published that the greatest flurry of letters appeared in the whole episode. Then, as if by magic, in the next week the following letter was prominently displayed in the *Exponent*:

> Dear Editor
> The student chapter of the American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineering (AIME) wishes to apologize to all of the persons who were offended by the sign that appeared on the AIME float during the homecoming parade, October 11, 1975. At the November 6 meeting of the AIME it was resolved that signs of this nature would not appear on any future AIME displays.
>
> Student Chapter AIME[13]

Rumor had it that the "magic" had come from the chancellor's office by way of the college of engineering dean. If that was true, did the AIME chapter really mean what it said? Skeptics, who had heard that some pretty raunchy remarks had been made at recent AIME meetings about us "libbers," gave their answer; others argued that whether the chapter meant it or not, what really counted was that AIME keep its word. Various women students personally expressed their delight to me over the way the whole affair had turned out; something at Platteville, it seemed, in November, 1975, had taken a step forward.

Then the December, 1975 *The Geode* was published. And in two places it made use of or referred to the "old saying" again. The "something at Platteville" now appeared simply to have dug its heels into the spiritual poverty of its past.

A New Response . . .

If the December *The Geode* helped turn the naive into skeptics and skeptics into cynics, it also served another purpose. It prompted a number of us to contemplate what the October, 1976 homecoming miners' float might display. Some among us still held the hope that through discussion with key persons in the college of engineering, Platteville's AIME could get on the side of human dignity.

By the spring of 1976 I was convinced that something was definitely planned by the AIME chapter which was intended to make its next float as much a conveyor of sick powerism as were its floats of the past. My conviction was based on a conversation carried on in my presence by several male faculty members, including one from the college of engineering.

In the beginning of the fall semester of 1976, some students expressed to me their concern about what the AIME float might involve, and I encouraged them to make inquiry to try to find out. One student, a member of the *Exponent* staff, went to the engineering dean himself, who, I was told, said he knew nothing about AIME's plans but that even if he did, he couldn't censor the students.

As October 9, the day of homecoming 1976, approached (with its theme of "rickety-rak, the spirit's back"), I talked with a friend of mine, Donna Gibbs, one of our continuing students. We had to admit that attempts to discover exactly what AIME's float plans were had failed. Still we felt sure that something was in the air and that we should prepare for it. I laughingly suggested that we form an egg brigade. Donna laughed, too, but when she picked me up on the day of the parade she came carrying in her hand a sack of eggs.

A glorious, sunny day; the crowd was in its usual happy mood; and the egg brigade sat itself down on the curb right smack in the middle of Main Street, U.S.A., in order to have a good vantage point for seeing, as soon as we could, as it came down the hill, what we were chiefly interested in.

We could hear the bands begin to play up by the university; the parade had begun; the man who had helped start the first women's studies program in the country and who perhaps had helped inspire AIME's public apology in the preceding year was driven by, smiling and waving. There were huge gaps in the parade, embarrassing, so unlike much better organized parades in the past. Donna and I commented on the evident decrease in the number of well-designed or colorful floats that had been a hallmark of this parade in past years. The drinking vets in their toilet car weaved by.

Finally what we had come for appeared, announcing its presence at first with the ringing of its miner's bell, then with the view of its outhouse. We strained our eyes to see what, if anything, deserved an egg. We certainly didn't want to waste any. I saw a woman or two in front of the outhouse.

Most of the people on the float were men, seated, drinking beer, and trying to look like miners. The float, travelling rather fast, was very close now; we could see the whites of their eyes, but it wasn't eyes we were looking for; it was something else. And then we saw it. I exclaimed, "There it is!" We leapt to our feet in unison, hands coming out of pockets with an egg in each.

I remember being so happy to see that Donna didn't "throw like a girl." I knew that I didn't, but we had really never talked about it. We had just assumed that each of us could pitch. And it was clear that we could. Splash! I saw the first egg I threw land right in the middle of the big sign, at the top of the back of the outhouse, which read: "keep 'em sterile, shod, and in the mine." (Later a photograph revealed another sign, lower down and therefore blocked from the view of most bystanders, which read, "mules you ASS"). Splash again! Donna hit the bull's eye too.

I only wish a photographer had been there to capture the expressions of total amazement and incredulity of the men on the float. No longer drinking beer or waving, they were in such a state of shock they seemed paralyzed, unable to do or say anything. They just sat there — staring — with their mouths open. It had been E-Day, and it would take them a long time, perhaps even a lifetime, to figure out what it all meant.

Meanwhile, back at UW-Platteville among those who had neither any clear sense of justice nor at least a quixotic sense of humor or adventure as our red-jacketed cowboy did, all hell was preparing to break loose. As the news spread through the campus, two opposing camps began to form among women and men, students and faculty alike, the friends of the egg brigade and the foes of the egg brigade. Just as the joy, laughter and celebration over E-Day by the friends increased, so, proportionately, the anger of the foes was intensified and led them, according to all the rumors I kept being told of daily by Donna, to try all sorts of things to get me.

Among some of the more exciting rumors about various threats and demands being made concerning me were that: 1) AIME students went to the police to get a warrant for my arrest but backed off when the police told them that the students could be arrested for drinking in a public thoroughfare; 2) letters were being written to the Board of Regents demanding that I be fired, and, in case that didn't work, letters were being written to Governor Lucey demanding that *he* fire me; 3) I was going to be forced to make a public apology for my despicable actions — one of the engineering students on the float, in fact, sent a letter to the *Exponent* as well as the *Platteville Journal* complaining of his having been "subjected to an irrational outburst of juvenile behavior directed towards the AIME float, and in particular the traditional remarks displayed on the miners' float every year" and of his becoming "the unwilling final resting place of several of Dr. Parsons' eggs"[14] (which unconscious *bon mot* kept many of us laughing for weeks) and demanding an apology; 4) at least and for sure, the chancellor, rumor insisted, had "really chewed me out."

As for what in truth the chancellor did, despite the pressures which I imagine he was under from the manic machos around the campus (the head of my department was accosted by a few, I know, and I heard through other sources about the bellicose feelings of others toward me; e.g. one faculty member expressed an intense desire to crush some eggs on my head, while another complained bitterly that I had "besmirched the reputation of all the faculty" and "ruined the image of the whole university"), he behaved in a most civilized manner through the whole crisis, speaking to me of everything he could think of *except* E-Day, and he laughed with the rest of us when about a month after the event, my philosophy colleague Ellsworth Hood brought me from the hand of his harpsichord-building wife, Margaret, a wonderful foot-high trophy, topped with a golden egg and inscribed: "award for eggcellence, 1976."

There was a comparable enthusiasm shown by a goodly number of people on the campus for the same vision. To cite just a few examples of those on campus who openly identified themselves with our friends, there was the director of the multicultural-educational center, John Williams, a black man in his seventies, who had no trouble at all recognizing what the issue was and who warmly thanked me for being such a "troublemaker;" there was also the senior, male engineering student who made a point of coming up to me in the midst of a Sunday liturgy at St. Augustine's University Parish to shake my hand vigorously and say, with smiling eyes and unmistakable fervor: "congratulations!" Finally, there were the four men students, only one of whom I knew personally, who within two weeks of E-Day sent a letter to the *Exponent* in which they said:

> How remarkably symbolic that a public display which made crude allusions to ovulation (or, rather, the lack of it) should be smattered with the things themselves. One can only wish the eggs had been rotten.
>
> We refer to the egg bombing of the AIME float during the 1976 homecoming parade. In our eyes it was the grandest thing to come of all the assorted rickety-raktivities. . .
>
> The AIME float was crude and tasteless. It deserved no better treatment. . .[13]

On the Meaning of Being Moral

This letter, to be sure, sent additional shock waves through those members of our campus community who were already in a state of anger and/or general confusion in the once closed and comfortable context of traditional remarks expressing traditional ideas of a traditional value system, that, namely, of powerism displayed in its most traditional (and universal) form, sexism. In particular I submit that angry reactions this time among the foes revealed a primary characteristic of any inverted value system, a mind-muddledness which makes it extremely difficult if not impossible to recognize the difference between a violation of (or violence done to) persons and an interference with such a violation itself through an attack upon the vehicle(s) of person-centered violence.

Such blindness, I would further argue, is but a reflection of the darkness created by an inverted value system because such a system of its nature makes it difficult if not impossible for those who take it for granted, find it acceptable or, at any rate, 'harmless,' to see that the context of their lives depends upon the stultification rather than the enhancement of human existence, the diminution rather than the expansion of personal freedom, and the rejection rather than the promotion of social responsibility. Both the timorous (controlled) and the pretentious (controllers) in such a setting cannibalize each other's souls. Thus any persons from an alien context who dare to interrupt this subtle savagery can hardly avoid the role not only of disturbers of the peace but also of threats to public security, the security, that is, of "knowing" what is socially sanctioned and what is not.

Hence, in the experience, for example, of many women and men students at Platteville the controversy-filled weeks immediately following October 9, 1976 were painfully unsettling. And while *eventually*, after many intense discussions both outside of classrooms and within them (and especially within the classes of my departmental colleagues), a genuine development of moral consciousness seemed to occur among a number of students who theretofore had never been faced with so concrete an occasion to reflect on the reality of legitimized, person-centered violence, *initially* the reaction of what I would judge was the majority of students ranged from anger to dismay — not over the traditional braggadocio of male vs. female power exhibited on the mining engineers' outhouse float but over the audacious behavior of the egg brigade in showing scorn for the exhibit.

Even some students, for instance, who liked me very much and who clearly wanted to trust me, were upset by the activity of the brigade. "After all, one doesn't throw eggs in public, does one? In fact, isn't it a terribly violent thing to do?" Such were the ideas that troubled my students. It was only gradually, through many hours of discourse with numerous individuals that a new (for them) idea began to take shape, the idea, namely, that what is countenanced by society is not necessarily moral, humanizing or right any more than what is discountenanced by society is necessarily immoral, dehumanizing or wrong. More specifically came the idea that causing people pain is not to be equated with injuring or harming them. And finally, the idea came that it is mainly because we become accustomed to what is so often an inverted image of what is good or worthwhile — as it is presented to us by our culture or traditions — that we can easily mistake a disruption of or an interference with violence for the real article.

It was precisely the difference between traditional or acceptable violence and untraditional and unacceptable interference with it that I strove to call attention to in a letter I sent to the *Exponent* and which it published the same day it printed the message from the four men students. At the same time, as may be seen from the following excerpt of the letter, I took the opportunity to entertain as well as edify:

> Dear Editor
> How can I thank you enough for the eggstraordinary space you gave my name in last week's *Eggsponent*? Since its publication, I can't tell you how many people I've met who've been laughing, smiling, winking, chuckling — people I don't even know! Then there are my classes. Absenteeism has dropped to zero, and even total strangers have been showing up — just to see, I suppose, what a bona fide egghead looks like.
>
> I must admit, however, that my recent eggsperience hasn't been all wine and roses. For eggsample, besides being called by the New York Yankees to pitch the opening game of the World Series for them (an invitation I had to decline when it was eggsposed that by reputation I could only hit the backside of a moving outhouse), I have been deluged by complaints from all sorts of people who felt slighted, mistreated, and generally outraged because they had not been made privy to the forming of the egg brigade.
>
> To all these disgruntled souls and in particular to those who are bitter because in retrospect they look upon October 9 as a lost opportunity for ridding themselves of the surplus from their tomato gardens, apologies are certainly due. There is no need to be disheartened, though, for I understand that plans are already being laid for next year's homecoming parade and that under appropriate conditions one part of it may become a veritable opera of the kind the Italians love to show their enthusiasm for by sending a marvelous assortment of fruits and vegetables to the stage. . .
>
> Finally, because I think the *Eggsponent* has contributed to an eggstreme misconception of what the egg brigade is all about, I believe it imperative to eggsplain the eggsact nature of the society. Contrary to prevailing eggsaggerated opinions about it, the brigade was constituted solely for the purpose of promoting friendly relations between Platteville women and UW-Platteville mining and metallurgical engineers. The idea, therefore, that the brigade on October 9 threw eggs at the AIME float is as far from the truth as the idea that the float's sign, "keep 'em sterile, shod, and in the mine" had any connection with last year's "keep em pregnant, barefoot, and out of the mine." In other words, anyone with an eggsiguous amount of intelligence would realize that eggs were not thrown *at* the float but *to* it so that the imbibing fellows there could have that hearty drink called egginyourbeer. Furthermore I have it from an eggspert source that no one was more surprised than the brigade members themselves when the boys didn't catch what was being pitched.
>
> Had they caught it, of course, they could have saved themselves and the rest of the community a lot of unnecessary eggasperation and eggsertion. Thus the whole eggsit-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

> ing episode perhaps tells us as much as anything could about the need for the eggspansion of a sense of romance at UW Platteville, for catching, like catching on, is largely an act of imagination. And with an insufficiency of that, one can only be puzzled by the following paraphrase of words from Daniel Berrigan: "Our apologies, good friends, for the fracture of society's order, the injuring of paper instead of people, the angering of the orderlies in the front parlor of the fecal house. We could not, so help us God, do otherwise."
>
> Eggsistentially yours,
> Barbara Parsons, Philosophy Department

History Is Not Destiny, It Is Irony

Reactions to this letter were probably what could be expected in a society partly sexist, partly free. There were those who loved it and those who apparently nearly had cardiac arrest when they read it. But there was still another group whose primary response seemed to be allied to what ancient thinkers called the first step toward wisdom, i.e., astonishment.

That was October 21, 1976. Imagine the reactions of all three groups when just three weeks later the *Exponent* carried an article, which the December *The Geode* reprinted, reporting that some months earlier the AIME students had adopted St. Barbara, for centuries considered a special friend of miners, as the chapter's "official patron saint." The students had apparently been moved to take this action when in the preceding year they had read a letter sent to their adviser by a Virginia engineering professor, Richard Lucas, who wrote:

> It takes no great effort to introduce St. Barbara into our mining schools as a symbol of mining culture and tradition. The annual observance of St. Barbara Day on or near December 4 will maintain it and develop a healthy moral interest among our students."

The chapter had even had "St. Barbara Day" buttons made which, when they arrived in November, were sold and bought for enough different reasons to make a psychologist weep from confusion.

Toward a Future by and for Persons

Thus ended the latest episode in a saga that had begun thirteen months earlier. Was sexism then gone from Platteville? Of course not, but then neither was sexism so confident, so cocksure, so content with itself as it had been. And there were women and men around who were determined to continue to expose the vacuous quality of its life so that it would appear less and less agreeable to fewer and fewer people.

With such a determined cadre, some of whom are part of our newly formed women's studies program, I, for one, believe that Platteville can be as good and hopeful a place as any in the University of Wisconsin System for students to come to know what it means to be a person. How could it be otherwise for those of us who do not believe that history is destiny but who believe, instead, the future to be radically open and who when faced with students content to settle for the mediocrities of sexist civilization are more than willing to egg them on to something better?

NOTES TO CHAPTER 8

1. Richard D. Gamble, *From Academy to University, 1866-1966: A History of Wisconsin State University, Platteville, Wisconsin* (Platteville, Wisconsin: Wisconsin State University, 1966), pp. 166-67.
2. Ibid., p. 167.
3. Ibid., p. 168.
4. William James, *Pragmatism* (Cleveland: Meridian Books, 1955), p. 51.
5. Barbara Parsons, *The Exponent*, October 23, 1975.
6. Bradley C. Scheel, *The Exponent*, November 13, 1975.
7. Jim Peek, *The Exponent*, November 13, 1975.
8. *The Exponent*, November 6, 1975.
9. Bob Levendoske and Steve Kopp, *The Exponent*, November 13, 1975.
10. John R. Payne, *The Exponent*, November 13, 1975.
11. Paul Ipsen, *The Exponent*, October 30, 1975.
12. Barbara Parsons, *The Exponent*, November 6, 1975.
13. Student Chapter AIME, *The Exponent*, November 20, 1975.
14. Robert W. Gates, *The Exponent*, October 14, 1976.
15. Bill Fellows, Brian Doyle, Nader Rastegar, Bob Leffler, *The Exponent*, October 21, 1976.
16. Barbara Parsons, *The Exponent*, October 21, 1976.
17. Richard Lucas quoted in *The Exponent*, November 11, 1976.

9. Chair, Chairman, Chairperson

by Carolyn Sylvander

The date is Friday, October 4, 1974. As you enter Van Hise Hall on the University of Wisconsin-Madison campus, you dodge and avoid scurrying young men with backpacks of books, young women coasting to bike racks on ten-speed Raleighs and Peugots. You pass bulletin boards cluttered with white and blue and pink papers promoting movies, trips, women's studies courses, rape crisis lines. The elevator removes you to the eighteenth floor, and you step out to a wide, carpeted expanse between quiet offices, with signs hustling you around to your left toward visitors' seats in the Board of Regents' room. There is a bustle up here, too, but of a more sedate, vested and suited kind. Hair is cut stylishly to the ears; heads are bent together over a subtle joke; handshaking and arm guiding facilitate greetings and movement. A reporter with a small note pad and a cocked ear wanders from group to group.

As you squeeze around to your left and slowly and quietly open the door to the board room, a guffaw, loud and long, strikes your ears. You retreat, embarrassed. But the laughter can't be at you. You hesitantly push open the door once again and look wide-eyed around the large, impressive, wood-paneled room. The laughter is not general. Several faces look as embarrassed as you feel. A couple of women against the far wall look pained. The faces of the chancellors lined along the right hand wall display alternating grimness and glee. Many people are glancing surreptitiously at others and adjusting their facial expressions according to what they see on their neighbors' faces. Whatever the joke, it is clearly at someone's expense, you decide, as you slip into an inconspicuous visitor's seat.

Around the large tables forming a square in the center of the room, recline the regents in their high-backed swivel chairs. Regent John Dixon has evidently been speaking. He continues. "The question in my mind, Mr. President, is do women with real pride and confidence want this type of neuter emphasis? Would Helen Hayes want it, or Florence Nightingale, or Catherine Cleary, or Miss America, or Cleopatra? This leaves only Bella Abzug and Jane Fonda carrying the torch."[1] Amid smiles and giggles, light dawns on you. The Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System is discussing item 3.A. on the day's agenda, a proposal to change their by-laws to designate heads of regent committees as "chairperson" or "chair" rather than "chairman."

Regent Dixon carries on, sliding from specious appeal to the unknowable authority of Florence Nightingale to the slippery-slope intimidation of creeping neuterism. "I can visualize how this type of thing would be extended into the future. The great songs of the barber shop chorales would go something like this, 'The person I marry will have to be the person I call my own,' or the famous Sigma Chi serenade will start 'the person of my dreams is the sweetest person,' and so forth and so forth. Or 'I want a person just like the person, who married dear old dad.' As Bobby Burns put it, 'a person is a person for all that.' That concludes my remarks."

People are laughing, but strangely, the new, supposedly ridiculous versions of the songs and the poetry don't really sound that odd to you. "The person of my dreams" suddenly puts you in the picture as possible dreamer, not just dream object. "A person is a person for all that" could open and close an insightful glimpse of what it means to be human, whether male or female. But your androgynous reflections are cut short by the continuing debate around the regents' table. As the rib-jabbing snickers subside, while uncomfortable people squirm and look down, or sit stiff and glare, president of the board Frank Pelisek resumes the floor. "John, you have had some great ones, but I think this is your finest hour."

Will Regent Dixon's illogical attempts to make the language change question ridiculous sway the board? You move forward in your back row seat, crane your neck to see what will come next. Regent Nancy Barkla attempts to undo what damage Dixon's cute jokes might have done. "I can only refer Regent Dixon and the rest of the members of the board back to the letter of Carolyn Sylvander, which was included in the minutes of the last meeting. I am only going to quote one paragraph from that letter:

> I am suggesting that what appear to be slight changes in language can have profound symbolic and connotative meaning, that language subtleties can display and affect our true concerns. The change from "chairman" to "chairperson," or "chair" is a small change, but words that English uses to stand for all of humankind, and our consciousness of that one sided designation of humanity is a step toward eliminating habits of thought which exclude women from consideration and from recorded history.

Regent Barkla's reference to the letter you wrote the regents after their July, 1974 meeting reminds you that what you are hearing and seeing in October represents progress of a sort — of a very necessary sort — for such progress is slow and by small steps. In July, as the board discussed changing its designated head from "president" to "chairman," to avoid confusion between president of the Board of Regents and president of the University of Wisconsin System, Regent Barkla had moved that "chairman" be made "chairperson." Her amendment then was greeted with much mirth. It was not seconded.

Upset after the July meeting, not just because no board member had had the courtesy to second Barkla's motion, but because the matter was treated as such a joke, you wrote your lengthy letter of protest and concern. The board had demonstrated a growing and strong commitment to affirmative action for women and minorities during the months you had attended its meetings as an administrative intern in central administration. The scorn and laughter over an affirming language change had reminded you of the changes you and your campus had gone through during your eight years as a female faculty member in the University of Wisconsin System. You wrote to the board members:

> You may think me over sensitive, but those of us who began speaking of the inequalities in treatment of women in the university five years ago — in pay, in promotion, in appointments — were greeted then with laughter sounding much like that which I heard on Friday, July 12, and while the laughter now reminds me that we have indeed come a long way, it also suggests that we have a way yet to go.
>
> Changes in language which reflect and affect changes in attitude, in thinking, in action, are still needed, I believe, and are not silly. Language is inherently symbolic, and its effect upon our thinking is so basic as to be beyond challenge or full analysis. A change such as that from "chairman" to "chairperson" looks slight only when the symbolic and subtle impact of language upon us is ignored or forgotten.

Accustomed to teaching composition and literature, including black American literature, you went on in your letter to draw the obvious but still widely unrecognized parallel between the change in terminology for black Americans and the words used to designate women and men.

> A major source and symbol of positive achievement for blacks has been, I think, the transformation of a term of historical denigration — "black" — into a term of pride and positive self image, through such simple and profound means as promotion of phrases like "black is beautiful" and "black power." No one has been more positively educated in this transformation process than whites, who are now aware that terms and principles developed and promoted by a minority group itself have a value for that group not achieved by accepting the labels and principles "laid on" from the majority culture. Whites didn't decide "Negro" would become "Afro-American" or "black" — blacks decided they preferred their own choices, and whites are now aware, for the most part, that blacks are not manipulated objects who can be labeled and forgotten, but full human beings with the same self-pride and need for self-determination as whites have historically prided themselves in.

Now at the October meeting, Regent John Lavine picks up and expands the parallel. "This board ought maybe to be mindful of the educational standard of anything we do. When the term 'Negro' changed to 'black,' or 'Latino' came into usage, or 'native American,' it was a term of pride. It was awkward at first, but it was a term of pride. It was a term which helped educate many people. And that is the basis of what we are talking about. I think we ought to be flexible enough to adopt a change which certainly symbolically and continually helps educate the people. An education body like ours is mindful that language has an educational function."

What is happening before your eyes and ears in Van Hise Hall is beginning to happen throughout the University of Wisconsin System and throughout the academic world in 1974. Sometimes with dramatic debates and news reports, more often in quiet but intense committee and department meetings, in quietly made changes in catalogs, brochures, news articles, from student government minutes at the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater, to publications of the Modern Language Association of America, male "neuter" terms are being transformed into true neuter terms or into terms including both sexes.

The transformation is not happening painlessly, however. Feminists who propose the change to non-sexist language are frequently laughed at, the duration and the vehemence of the laughter betraying a deeper concern about "small" language changes than the jokesters admit. Some resisters who have progressed beyond the joking stage nevertheless object to the "awkwardness" of changing he to he or she, or mankind to humanity. But as Eleanor J. Crandall, director of publications at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay writes in an article called "A No Nonsense Approach to Non-Sexist Language," "what appears to be awkward is often simply unfamiliar. The awkwardness of 'he or she' quickly vanishes with frequent use. I now find myself jarred more often by its absence than by its presence."[2] Publishers such as McGraw-Hill began in 1974 to describe for their writers and editors the ways in which non-sexist language can be employed smoothly, but fully in all their publications.

Going beyond simply neuterizing terms, the "underlying principle" of all non-sexist writing, Crandall says, is equal treatment. "The principle is easy to test. After writing something about a woman, replace her name with that of a man. If it reads equally well, you've done it correctly. If it sounds silly or out of place, go back and try again." Equal treatment for male and female students, faculty and staff in the language of written documents inevitably supports affirmative action and equal opportunity. When a search and screen committee for chancellor at one of the University of Wisconsin campuses writes in a job description that "She or he shall be chief presiding officer of the campus," the announcement unquestionably encourages all readers to think in terms of both female and male candidates for the position.

But despite arguments in favor of change, and despite smooth and competent ways to get around awkwardness, women who have achieved positions of prominence in the university sometimes prove to be resistant, providing opponents of language change with the opportunity to avoid change. Will the University of Wisconsin Board of Regents be progressive and sensitive enough in October, 1974 to make the small but significant change from "chairman" to "chairperson" for its committee heads? Regents Carolyn Sandin and Barbara Thompson resist — effectively. They see the change narrowly, in reference to themselves. "I have not had any problems being called chairman," says Sandin. "I have been chairman of school committees, of the school board for eight years. It never bothers me to be called madam chairman." "I agree with Regent Sandin," adds Regent Thompson. "I have never opposed being called chairman or madam chairman."

Regent Mary Williams, however, provides the letter writer with a great deal of encouragement. She recognizes that the change has significance beyond her own sense of security in leadership positions. "I felt somewhat the same way Mrs. Sandin and Mrs. Thompson do before I received the letter from Carolyn Sylvander. I thought that she stated some things very well and I do believe we deal with a language which is symbolic, that there is very much imagery and thought which occurs because of language which we use.... I think it would be a significant change and one we really don't need to get emotional about."

Regent Lavine's motion to amend, changing "chair" to "chairperson" in the main motion, actually receives a majority of the votes cast on agenda item 3.A — the vote is eight to six — but changes in regent by-laws require a "majority of the [sixteen] members of the board," not a majority of those voting, so the move to amend fails. The main motion, to change "chairman" to "chair," fails on a tie vote, seven to seven, with Dixon, Pelisek, Sandin, and Thompson among those voting "no."

You leave Van Hise Hall that day with mixed feelings. Disappointed that your letter was not convincing enough to win an effective majority, still you count six people who have thought more deeply on the issue. Sorry that the *Milwaukee Journal* article headline today will read "no chairperson for UW regents" rather than "UW regents embrace non-sexist language," you nevertheless know that the matter will come up again. Emerging from the building into the fresh October air of Madison, Wisconsin, you find your optimism corroborated in the coeducation swirling around you. These strong, direct, confident young women with their bikes and books and beliefs will certainly expect the language of their university to reflect the reality of their lives. With their nudging, time will bring a change. Whatever the vote on the eighteenth floor of Van Hise this day, sexism in language is definitely on its way out you conclude, as you stride up to the curb and stick out your thumb for a ride to the off-campus parking lot.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 9

1. Papers of the Board of Regents Meeting, October 4, 1974, University Archives, University of Wisconsin, Madison.
2. Eleanor Crandall, "A No Nonsense Approach to Non-Sexist Language," *CASE Currents*, vol. 2, no. 1 (July 1976).

10. Women's Athletics at Madison and Title IX

by Kit Saunders

The initiation of basketball at Smith College in 1892, soon after the game was invented, introduced the element of competition and a whole new era of sports for women.[1] Opposition by women physical educators was immediate and intercollegiate sport for women became an issue which was to be pursued and debated until the present day.[2]

There were probably two issues involved. One was that fierce competition for women was antithetical to the victorian ideal of how a woman should behave. The second issue which immediately concerned physical educators was that concentration on a few skilled players would lead to the neglect of many lesser skilled individuals as well as to commercialization of the competitive activities. Given the early uncontrolled development of men's athletics, women educators had good reason for some of their fears.

The development of women's athletics at the University of Wisconsin-Madison has reflected the national trends and philosophies. An early form of intercollegiate competition was the playday, in which teams from different colleges mixed for competition; beginning in the late 1920s, by 1936 the playday was the competitive mode used in many American colleges and universities. Next came sports days which permitted teams from different schools to compete against each other.[3] These teams however had limited practice and coaching.

Although male historians have held that women have had no intercollegiate sport history, Ellen Gerber points out that it is an error to discount these other legitimate forms of intercollegiate competition. Gerber asserts that this attitude has been responsible for a great deal of ignorance about the history of women in sports.[4]

The playday, sports day phenomena, also occurred at the University of Wisconsin. As early as the 1890s there was interest on the part of women, and in 1895 Coach Andrew O'Dea consented to coach the ladies' boating crew. Women's basketball was introduced at Wisconsin in 1897, coached by both men and women. Games were held against the Milwaukee Normal team and several high school teams. Lack of sufficient coaching and practice time soon discouraged this interschool competition, and within two years the competition became interclass.[5] And so it remained, basically, for over sixty years. *Badger* yearbooks from before 1920 show women's teams, women receiving honor letters and wearing athletic sweaters with the year of their accomplishment, but these were interclass teams and not intercollegiate teams.

By the end of the century athletics for men had become firmly established at UW. The faculty had reluctantly moved to establish eligibility rules, and had helped to create an association with other universities in an attempt to control the conditions of intercollegiate competition among its members. This became the Western Conference of Faculty Representatives, or the Big Ten Conference. The basic pattern had been set.[6] The next years were to unfold a story of institutional ambivalence, a strong movement to keep athletics on an amateur basis and the even stronger movement toward bigger and bigger profits.[7] Student interest in men's athletics just after the turn of the century approached fanaticism. Professor Schlichter in 1903 called it a period of "ultra-athleticism."[8] The next thirty years included revisions of the athletic committee to control athletics and one major investigation of men's intercollegiate athletics.[9] In addition, in January of 1932 an historical decision was made by the faculty which stated that:

> beginning with the fiscal year 1932-33 intercollegiate athletics be administered as a separate department, distinct from the department of physical education as a whole; that there be a director of intercollegiate athletics who shall be responsible to the university faculty, through the athletic board of the faculty.[10]

This decision would have a profound effect upon athletics in general and upon the future of athletics for women at Wisconsin.

Meanwhile, women's athletics at the University of Wisconsin, as at most other universities, was being conducted by the Women's Recreation Association (WRA). Organizations called women's athletic associations or women's recreation associations existed in a large percentage of colleges and universities. They were typically sponsored by the physical education department and were run by a coalition of students and faculty. The power of the WAA's and WRA's lasted until the 1960s when the growth of the women's sports programs made it necessary to move to more centralized administration.[11] More control and consistency could only occur through the establishment of professional positions.

The WAA's and the philosophy behind them were especially important at Wisconsin because of one individual, Blanche M. Trilling. The WAA's were nationally organized in 1917 by Blanche Trilling of UW when she spearheaded the development of the Athletic Conference of American College Women, later to become the Athletic and Recreation Federation of College Women. The ACACW opposed intercollegiate competition for women and favored girls' rules for basketball. In addition, it encouraged alignment of the WAA on each campus with the department of physical education and likewise fostered student participation in the organization and administrative aspects of such programs.[12] It is interesting to note that today the Association of Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (AIAW) is also including student participation and leadership at the national level. The ACACW had an important role in the development of women's sports in colleges and universities.

Blanche Trilling's leadership had further influence upon women's athletics nationally, and at UW. In the early 1920s, the Amateur Athletic Union attempted to take control of women's athletics, angering women physical educators who decided to organize. The women believed that they were the only group with the necessary professional expertise to control women's sports. In 1924 when the women's division of the National Amateur Athletic Federation was founded, Blanche Trilling was instrumental in developing its platform. The philosophy of this platform shaped women's athletics in this country for more than forty years.

The platform favored the promotion of physical activity for the largest possible proportion of persons in any group.[13] The slogan of the WAA's which emanated from this platform was "a team for every girl and every girl on a team."[14]

Trilling's philosophy on competition is well expressed by her statement in the 1929 *Wisconsin Athletic Review*:

> I positively do not approve of competition for women and of the undue emphasis that is placed on individual accomplishment and the winning of championships. Rather than conforming with the structural characteristics and social traits of women, they are an imitation of the rules and activities in boys' and men's events.[15]

Trilling further believed that, until there were ample playgrounds and gymnasiums in all schools and until every girl had the fullest opportunity to engage in athletics, the schools should conserve their energy and money instead of spending both on a form of sport competition "that is, at best of doubtful value."[16]

The *Wisconsin State Journal* in 1929 stated that a warning of this kind "from an authority such as Miss Trilling is recognized to be, should be given deep consideration by physical education teachers and parents all over the country."[17] And indeed it was, for as Kessenich reports, she was "one of the best speakers in her field" and so managed to spread her ideals.[18] Her standards influenced the entire country, and were scrupulously followed at UW.

As one would expect, therefore, women's competitive sports, both on the interclass and intercollegiate level, inasmuch as this form existed, was governed by the WRA, within the department of physical education for women. Student leadership was essential to the organization and one faculty member was assigned as WRA advisor. During this period women's attitudes toward sports can be characterized as passive. However, passivity ended in the general spirit of student unrest during the last ten years.

A situation was developing at UW that reflected a national phenomenon. The responsibilities of the WRA had begun to divide into two distinct areas. One was the intramural program, and the other was the intercollegiate program. Athletics did not replace recreation, but both responsibilities were becoming too large and too complex for one student-run organization.

In 1966 and 1967, UW-Madison was somewhat behind many of the former Wisconsin State University campuses in the development of intercollegiate programs, probably because many of the faculty members still adhered to the non-competitive philosophy of the 1930s. Intercollegiate sports programs for women were not a high priority within the department. Nevertheless, what support there was came from the department of physical education for women, and the years following 1967 saw increased interest and growth in the competitive sports program for women. Facilities and equipment were readily shared, limited use of fleet cars was funded, office space was provided, a half-time position for the sports coordinator/WRA advisor was funded, and some released time from teaching was allocated for sports advisors.

In 1967, Kit Saunders was given responsibility for administering the women's sports program. It soon became apparent that the department of physical education for women would not be able to bear the entire burden of support for the growing program. Graduate students and physical education instructors were becoming weary of advising competitive sports. Advising was rapidly becoming coaching, requiring more energy and time. The department was unable to underwrite sufficient released time from teaching assignments.

The club sport program, which was organized in 1970, offered an interim solution. The traditional concept of club sports is to give student organized groups an opportunity to compete and to use facilities. To include women's competitive sports was stretching the club sport concept considerably. It did, however, provide a structure for the program, some priority for use of facilities, and after the first year, some funding. Milt Bruhn was appointed director of the club sports and Kit Saunders women's sports coordinator. In 1971-72, $2,000 was allocated to the women's program. Each sport received from $100 to $500, depending upon its level of development. In 1972-73 this was raised to $8,000, and some compensation was channeled to sport advisors for the first time.

Each year, the women's sports coordinator had to appear before the intramural recreation board with requests for funding and sometimes for facilities. These meetings were frequently harrowing experiences. This board had responsibility for the club sport program, partial responsibility for men's intramurals, and for allocation of capital expenditures from funds generated from student fee monies. Each year it became more difficult to convince the board to adequately fund the growing program. For 1973-74, $18,000 was secured from the board. The additional $7,000 which had been requested was refused. The board was increasingly questioning the utilization of student fee monies to fund coaching of women's sports. The women's program was wearing out its welcome in the club sport program as it became more expensive and more closely resembled an intercollegiate program. That an "intercollegiate paranoia" was creeping into the picture is illustrated in the following statement from intramural recreation board minutes:

> The need for additional coaching for women's extramural activities was discussed in detail as was the coaching support for men's intercollegiate athletics in contrast. The intramural recreation board was unable to fund the extramural club sport program at a level adequate to provide the coaching necessary and the competitive level of activity that exists for men.[19]

The women's sports coordinator was forced to go to the chancellor of the UW-Madison campus to secure the remainder of the funding which was necessary to run the program for 1973-74. Although this cannot be found in intramural recreation board minutes, this action so annoyed the board (or at least its chair) that the board actually considered not allocating the agreed upon amount of $18,000.

There was, about this time, another impetus for women's athletics. If one were to point to a single most important factor in the gains in women's sports nationally, it would be Title IX of the Education Amendments Act of 1972. Title IX directs:

> No person in the United States shall on the basis of sex be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any activity receiving federal financial assistance.[20]

Title IX is similar to Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 which banned discrimination, except that Title IX applies to discrimination based on sex, is limited to education programs and activities, and includes employment.[21] Although athletics is only one of the areas covered by Title IX, it has been one which has received a great deal of attention. The National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) has probably spent more money, time, and energy than any other group attempting first to exempt income sports from Title IX, and finally bringing a lawsuit against the Department of Health, Education and Welfare in an attempt to exempt athletics altogether.

In July of 1972, Chancellor Edwin Young appointed a committee to study women's athletics and designated Athletic Director Elroy Hirsch as its chair. As of March, 1973 the committee had met once and a second meeting that had been called never materialized. Professor Muriel Sloan, chair of the department of physical education for women, was an appointed committee member. In a letter to Hirsch, dated March 2, 1973, she stated:

> For me to remain on this inactive committee is to continue the illusion for women students and interested faculty groups that the problem of facilities for women is being seriously considered. . . . You can see, therefore, that my membership on this non functioning committee and its non functioning status is untenable. I would prefer that the committee begin to function rather than resigning from it. If, however, you as chairman and other committee members are not equally devoted to pursuing the committee charge, then all should disband. A new committee could then be appointed by the chancellor, or existing groups concerned with equal opportunity on campus can follow up on their expressed interest in the issue.[22]

On March 16, a letter was sent to Hirsch by Associate Professor Ruth Bleier, chair of the Association of Faculty Women, pointing out the requirements of Title IX and demanding immediate and equal use of facilities and adequate and equal funding for all women's teams.[23]

Apparently on March 21 Assistant Chancellor Cyrena Pondrom offered use of a shower facility in the memorial shell, and the athletic department offered to provide soap and towels to women joggers, but, through some quirk in communication, perhaps, the faculty women apparently were not aware of this offer.[24]

On April 3, 1973 a complaint against UW was filed with the HEW Office of Civil Rights. It stated that:

> The University of Wisconsin, Madison campus, is in flagrant violation of Executive Order 11246, as amended, and of Title IX. . .in its continued provision of unequal facilities and funding for athletics programs for women students and employees and unequal compensation for the coaching of its women's teams.[25]

On April 19, 1973 Young appointed a new chair for the committee on women's athletics, Murray Fowler, professor emeritus of the department of linguistics. His letter of appointment stated:

> For our immediate purposes, I should like to receive recommendations from the committee by or before July 1 concerning remodeling, rescheduling or other changes which will enable us to achieve a greater degree of equity for women staff and students in athletic programs and facilities for the coming academic year. Following that. . .I should like to receive recommendations. . .concerning the best way fully to achieve equity in athletic programs and facilities.[26]

This committee, composed of men and women from physical education, athletics, several departments unrelated to athletics, and several students met eighteen times over a period of almost one year. It first considered the broad scope of physical recreational opportunities. By May, 1973 a document entitled, "Recommendations of the Women Members of the Chancellor's Committee" had been considered and passed by the committee. The number one concept included in the recommendations and passed by the committee was:

> All physical recreation facilities administered by the University of Wisconsin should be made available for use by both men and women.[27]

It was made clear that the facilities included appropriate and adequate restrooms, locker and dressing facilities, showers and towel service. The red gym and unit II were both included.

The recommendations also made it clear that women should be made to feel that it was appropriate for them to be utilizing these facilities. Thus, women to dispense towels, custodians observing the recreation hours and not attempting to clean during the women's hours as had happened in the past, assignment of some of the more desirable hours to women, publicizing the availability of these facilities, and a positive attitude on the part of those who staff these facilities were all recommended changes.

The facilities were also to include different levels of participation for women, including competitive teams, faculty, and non-competitive recreation. The last point in the recommendations, that an adequate structure be provided for the administration of women's competitive sports, was to take another several months of committee work.

The results of the recommendations were that locker rooms and shower facilities were remodeled to accommodate women in the red gym, unit II, and the memorial shell. Locker rooms were remodeled in Lathrop Hall to accommodate more men than the facilities at that time allowed.

The coordinator of sports for women, Kit Saunders, presented a proposal to the executive committee of the department of physical education for women asking that they approve a plan for women's intercollegiate athletics to be administered within the department. Although some members of the department regarded the idea favorably, it was not approved. Perhaps the major reason for the department being less than enthusiastic about the proposal was that it had been made clear to them by campus administration, through the dean of the school of education, that it would be difficult if not impossible to channel sufficient additional funding through the school of education. There were also several key individuals who were still not in favor of intercollegiate athletics for women and therefore were not in favor of taking on this responsibility.

The physical education department did, however, agree to provide consultants. Several individuals had already worked hard trying to establish equity for women in both recreation and athletics and had served on the chancellor's committee. These women, in addition to Saunders, were Sloan, Assistant Professor Mary Lou Remley, and Associate Professor Julia Brown.

By December, 1973 the women members of the chancellor's committee were ready with another proposal. This proposal was passed intact by the committee. The following statement was included in the preamble to the proposal:

> We believe that combining athletic programs [men's and women's] will be beneficial from the outset for women's athletics and in the long run also for men's athletics in the educational setting of the university.[illegible]

Several essential provisions were included. They were to be followed almost without exception when the proposal was adopted by the university. They were:

> That a woman whose title shall be director of intercollegiate athletics for women shall be responsible directly to the director of intercollegiate athletics.

> In an expedient a manner as possible, more women shall be included in the membership of the athletic board.
>
> A student athletic council shall be set up for women.[9]

Several provisions were included relative to personnel. They were:

> Separate teams by sex shall be supported and separate coaches for men's and women's teams shall be hired whenever this is feasible.
>
> As soon as possible provision shall be made for the inclusion of more women in the division of intercollegiate athletics. (Including sports information and an athletic trainer.)[10]

There were also provisions relative to funding. The proposal stated:

> In order to meet the HEW guidelines effectuating Title IX of the Educational Amendments Act of 1972, provision must be made for funding of women's athletics.

A second provision relative to funding suggests that an amount of money proportionate to that allocated to men's grants-in-aid be allocated to provide for drastic upgrading of women's programs including salaries, uniforms and equipment.[11]

It was pointed out that scheduling of regulation facilities for practices and competition was an important priority. Not only must adequate time be scheduled, but this provision called for scheduling of facilities for women's athletics at hours of the day which are reasonably convenient for students. It was also suggested that if generally undesirable hours must be scheduled then a rotation system should be set up for men's and women's teams.[12]

The athletic board had recommended an amendment to the laws and regulations of the University of Wisconsin on November 5 of that year. The amendment added to the "no discrimination policy" on athletics so that the policy included a ban on discrimination on the basis of sex.[13] This opened the door to the inclusion of women's intercollegiate athletics within the division of intercollegiate athletics, which was officially accomplished in May, 1974. Kit Saunders was appointed the first director of women's intercollegiate athletics at the time.

The women's intercollegiate athletic program, including eleven sports which had been developed by women within the department of physical education for women and the club sports program, officially moved operations into the stadium in July of 1974. Badminton, basketball, crew, fencing, field hockey, golf, gymnastics, swimming, tennis, and track were included. The fact that these eleven sports had developed in spite of inadequate funding and other hardships is important. Tremendous strides have been made since 1974 because of the resources and assistance made available because of new support from the university. However, it should not be forgotten that there was a sound basic program already in existence before 1974.

The "new" women's intercollegiate athletic program began in 1974-75 with a budget of $118,000. That represented a substantial increase over previous budgets and provided better coaching salaries, uniforms, equipment and travel schedules. For the first time all women athletes and their coaches were covered by accident insurance and medical personnel were made available. Although the budget was not sufficient to fund a full time athletic trainer, a program of student athletic trainers was initiated with the cooperation of Gordon Stoddard, head men's trainer. The small training room adjacent to the women's locker room in unit II was outfitted and set up for use by women athletes.

By 1975-76, a budget of $160,000 had been approved. By this time a position of women's athletic trainer was established and Gail Hirn, a physical therapist, was hired. The main training room in the stadium was made available to women more extensively and the training room in unit II was doubled by utilizing an existing training room. In 1976-77 the half-time position of women's sports publicist was made full time which enabled Phyllis Krutsch to expand the program she had already begun to develop.

Since 1974 there has been significant progress. Coaching salaries and percent of full time equivalencies have increased, and the projections for the next three years continue this trend. Assistant coaches have been added in track, gymnastics, volleyball, basketball, and crew.

The department of physical education for women and the director of intercollegiate athletics for women have worked cooperatively so that several new coaches could be recruited and offered joint full-time appointments.

As of 1976-77, practice facilities and times have been improved for almost all sports. Frequently men's and women's teams share facilities and practice times; a fine esprit de corps between the men and women athletes is developing. In addition, some competitions have been combined quite successfully. For instance, in track meets women's and men's events are alternated, and the same practice is being undertaken for gymnastics.

Facilities problems still exist in crew because the existing crew house is inadequate for the two huge programs. Another inadequate facilities area is coaches' offices. In early 1977, five offices were ready for coaches of nine women's sports. Even this is inadequate, but is certainly an improvement over having no offices.

The other facility in which women do not share priority with the men's teams is in the use of the fieldhouse for basketball. The women's varsity team has second priority to the men's varsity team. The reason for this is that men's basketball is classified as an income sport and women's basketball is not.

An athletic grant-in-aid program was initiated for women in 1975-76. As of 1976-77 there are forty grants, and approximately twenty will be added each year until UW-Madison reaches the AIAW maximum for each sport, or until the number is the same proportion by participants to the men's grants.

At present, the women's grants are limited to tuition and fees and the men's include room, board, tuition, fees, tutoring and book loan. The NCAA failed to limit grants at their January, 1977 convention. The UW-Madison and many other universities will therefore be forced to either limit men's grants on their own or to increase women's grants to full scholarships in order to meet the equality mandate of Title IX. It is unlikely that many universities can afford full scholarships for both men and women. Nevertheless, at this time it is important that grant-in-aid programs for both men and women be economically feasible and equitable.

In the fall of 1975 the women's intercollegiate sports club was founded. WIS club, as it is called, is the first booster club for women's athletics in the Big Ten and probably one of the first in the country. Its aim is to promote the growth of women's athletics. WIS club has conducted several events in conjunction with major women's competitions to increase community involvement and awareness, sponsored a dinner for all women athletes and coaches, and sponsored one of the first highlight films for women's athletics in the country. By the end of its first year it had almost 200 members. Jackie Vastola, who succeeded Doreen Holmgren as president, helped develop some major fund raising projects. During its second year, WIS club incorporated and expanded its board of directors, which includes both men and women.

On the Madison campus a thirteen-member athletic board exercises the power of the faculty over athletics. Of the thirteen members, seven are faculty. UW-Madison has three women with a vote on the board. Muriel Sloan was the first woman to be appointed. The other two voting women are Dr. Betty Bamforth of the medical school and Betty Vaughn, an alumni representative. One woman student athlete shares a vote with a male athlete. It is hoped that more women will be added as three and one half votes on a thirteen member board are not many. It is, however, more representative than the controlling boards of most universities that have combined athletic programs.

The University of Wisconsin women's athletic program is subject to the rules and regulations of the Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Woman (AIAW) and the men are subject to the rules and regulations of the NCAA and the Big Ten Conference.

There is a national power struggle going on in intercollegiate sport. The NCAA, after years of neglect of women's sports and after futile attempts to exempt athletics from Title IX, would now like to take over women's athletics. Two reasons for this are: (1) to represent both men and women college athletes in order to give the NCAA the greatest international sports power, and (2) to cash in on the profits which are beginning to accrue from the televising of women's national championships.

The Wisconsin athletic board does support AIAW. However, it is worried over some rules differences for men and women in the two national organizations. The board sees a single conference for men and women at the big ten level as a way to solve these differences and has issued several statements saying so. The latest was issued in October of 1976.

The women directors of the big ten universities, on the other hand, are hesitant to jump into a single conference structure, even though it might be "revised," because they see the control of their programs going almost entirely to men. If a single conference were adopted, the heads of all the athletic boards most likely would be male, as they are now, and the faculty members *with the vote* in the conference would be male, as they are now. As Frederick Haberman, chair of the Wisconsin athletic board, was quoted recently, "Frank Remington is our representative now and I think he can represent the women as profoundly and fairly as he does the men."[14]

In addition to having no vote in the revised Big Ten Conference, the women believe that if women in a conference as nationally prominent as the big ten join with the men, the NCAA could use that to their advantage in their struggle with the AIAW. The council of ten, which consists of the presidents of all of the big ten institutions, has taken control of the problem. At their December, 1976 meeting, Robbin Fleming, chair of the council of ten, assigned a committee the task of formulating a plan for a single conference structure which could be effectuated within two years. The committee includes three women athletic directors, several men athletic directors, one faculty representative, and will add several presidents.

The block "W" awarded for excellence in athletics is awarded to both men and women. Early in the 1970s, letters from the University of Michigan, particularly from the executive director of the "M" club, the footall coach, and the basketball coach, suggested that awarding the block "M" to women would so diminish the value of the award that they would consider changing the award for men. In contrast, Hirsch stated that the same letter award for men and women would certainly be appropriate, and football coach John Jardine believed that the more athletes (men and women) on campus wearing the block "W" the better. In the spring of 1977, the board of directors of the national W club voted to extend membership to women letter winners. This was indeed an historic move and made UW one of the first universities to include both women and men in its letter club, thus breaking a long-standing male athletic tradition.

Accomplishments of Wisconsin women athletes have been notable over the initial three-year period. Diver Peggy Anderson has the honor of being UW's first individual AIAW national champion. She won the three meter diving title in 1976. The UW women's crew team upset the usually dominant eastern schools by winning the national championship in 1975. In 1976 they came back to take second place without four members of the varsity eight team who were at the invitational olympic training camp and trials. Three UW oarswomen, Carie Graves, Peggy McCarthy, and Jackie Zoch became the first UW women athletes to make an olympic team. They helped row the United States' 8-oared shell to a close second against the strong, veteran East German team.

The UW women's track team became the first UW team to win a big ten championship in 1976. In the fall of 1976, UW hosted its first AIAW national championship by holding the cross country championships at Yahara Hills Golf Course. The UW women's team surprised everyone by coming in an impressive third. Outstanding performances were turned in by freshman Ann Mulrooney, who finished fifth, and sophomore Mary Beth Spencer, who finished eleventh.

Cindy Bremser became UW's first world class runner, making a United States squad to run in Yugoslavia during the summer of 1975, and running in the Pan American games later that year.

Wisconsin women's intercollegiate athletic conference championships (WWIAC) have been won in track, volleyball, gymnastics, and swimming. Outstanding individual records too numerous to mention have been set in several sports. Field hockey, badminton, and golf have been less successful, but are in the process of building; and basketball has the potential of becoming one of the more exciting women's sports.

UW-Madison has been a member of WWIAC from the beginning and helped to develop it. Recently, however, several problems have arisen which have required special attention. Because Madison has dominated some, but not all sports, and has the potential to dominate more because of size, budget, and grants-in-aid, compared to other state university members, UW-Madison has agreed not to participate in conference championships in swimming, track, and tennis for the 1977-78 year and to cope with the problems of each sport as they appear. When the state conference championship is a requisite for advancement to regional and national AIAW competition, special qualifying tournaments will be held. These are some indications of growing pains as UW-Madison develops a strong women's athletic program.

Women's athletics programs at UW-Madison have grown and improved but gains have not come without a great deal of effort. The women involved in athletics have worked with the physical education department and the university administration to achieve equity. The university administration and the athletic department administration have taken a positive stance. Associate Athletic Director Otto Breitenbach has been extremely fair and helpful. The men and women coaches have been willing to work together well under difficult circumstances and overcrowded facilities. The attitude toward the women's program within the university and the Madison community is positive. Even the media have improved somewhat in their coverage of women's events. The absolute need to work together will undoubtedly benefit both women's and men's athletics and will determine the future of both programs.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 10

1. Ellen W. Gerber, et al, *The American Woman in Sport*. (Reading, Mass.: Addison Wessley Publishing Company, 1974), p. 69.
2. Mary Lou Remley, *Twentieth Century Concepts of Sports Competition for Women*. (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Southern California, 1970), p. 1.
3. Gerber, p. 65.
4. Ellen W. Gerber, "Intercollegiate Athletics: Tale of the Journey from Purdah," (Speech presented to NAGWS/AIAW at AAHPER Convention, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, April 5, 1976).
5. Kathy Opalewski, "The Development of UW-Madison Women's Intercollegiate Athletics," unpublished paper submitted for master's degree in journalism (Madison, Wisconsin, 1975), p. 8.
6. Merle Curti and Vernon Carstensen, *The University of Wisconsin. A History — 1848-1925*, 2 vols., (Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1949), 1:710.
7. Ibid.
8. Curti, 2:535.
9. Ray A. Brown, et al., "Report of the Special Committee Elected to Study the Subject of Intercollegiate Athletics," (Report to the Faculty, Madison, Wisconsin, January, 1932), Document 399, p. 2.
10. Minutes of the Postponed Regular Faculty Meeting, January 18, 1932, p. 296.
11. Gerber, *The American Woman In Sport*, p. 77.
12. Richard C. Swanson, "From Glide to Stride: Significant Events in a Century of American Women's Sport," *Women's Athletics — Coping with Controversy*, ed. Barbara J. Hoepner (Washington, D.C.: AAHPER Publications, 1974), p. 49.
13. Gerber, *The American Woman in Sport*, p. 71.
14. Katherine L. Cronin, "Blanche M. Trilling," a statement formulated at the request of a graduate student at the Ohio State University, August 11, 1951.
15. "U.W. Director Assails Olympiad for Women," *Wisconsin State Journal*, October 3, 1929.
16. Fred Wittner, "Miss Trilling Favors General Participation," *The Wisconsin Alumni Review*, February, 1929.

17. Ibid.

18. Henrietta Kessenich, "Blanche M. Trilling — A Leader," *The Wisconsin Alumnus*, vol. 39, no. 1 (November, 1937), p. 9.

19. Minutes of the Intramural Recreation Board Meeting, April 12, 1973, p. 3.

20. Non-Discrimination on Basis of Sex-Education Programs and Activities Receiving or Benefitting from Federal Financial Assistance," *Federal Register*, vol. 40, no. 108, part 2 (June 4, 1975, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare), p. 24128.

21. Marjorie Blaufarb, "Retrospect on a Year of Title IX Discussions," *Up Date*, *AAHPER*, Washington, D.C. (February, 1975), p. 1.

22. Muriel R. Sloan to Elroy Hirsch, March 2, 1973.

23. Ruth Bleier to Elroy Hirsch, March 16, 1973.

24. Hirsch to Bleier, April 3, 1973; Bleier to Hirsch, April 17, 1973.

25. Bleier to Odessa Fellows, Office of Civil Rights, April 3, 1973.

26. Edwin Young to Murray Fowler, April 19, 1973.

27. "Recommendations of the Women Members of the Chancellor's Committee," University of Wisconsin, May, 1973.

28. "Proposal for the Administration and Conduct of Women's Intercollegiate Athletics," submitted by the women members of the chancellor's committee, December 4, 1973, p. 1.

29. Ibid., pp. 1, 2.

30. Ibid., p. 2.

31. Ibid., p. 3.

32. Ibid., p. 3.

33. *Laws and Regulations of the University of Wisconsin*. (Madison, Wisconsin: University Committee on Modification, 1969), p. 48.

34. Kathy Foster, "Women Want a Voice When Big Ten Revised," *The Capital Times*, October 19, 1976.

11. Merging Two Careers and Marriage

by Agate and Harry Krouse

As undergraduate English majors at Indiana University in the late 1950s, we did not often reflect about education for women. Our friends, both male and female, were going to school, discussing Donne and Kerouac, worrying about staying in the honors program and getting scholarships or loans, working at the library or in dining halls. It wasn't until we graduated and some of us continued for our M.A.'s at Indiana that an occasional jarring difference — some *personal* unfairness, we thought — startled us.

Once as we were exchanging the baby in front of a classroom — one of us tried to have early, the other late classes — a bright former classmate, now a file clerk in the registrar's office, asked abruptly, "*Both* of you still in school? What about Harry's *career*? Jim's far too busy studying to push a stroller around." As Agate was trying to quiet the baby for another exchange — what if a child's cry should disturb the seminar in nineteenth century American literature — a venerable senior professor stopped, hesitated, put on his best formal manner, and said, "I hear you are to be congratulated, and so I should. But I did think *you* wouldn't marry, let alone have a child. Helen White at Wisconsin, you know, never did. Still, the life of a faculty wife is a pleasant one. Plenty of time for reading and even politics, especially after the children are older. Ah, well. . . Yes, congratulations. Is it a boy or a girl?"

As we talked while jointly cooking supper, shopping for groceries, cleaning the hopeless forty dollar a month apartment, or making our own beer, we would occasionally muse about our former classmates. Those who were graduate students would drop by to talk about professors and papers; their wives seldom came. They were either cleaning, doing the laundry, baking bread, or washing their hair. They worked forty hours a week. Their backs hurt. And they were understandably bored with hearing about the details of bibliographic description, Professor X's grading system, and Professor Y's latest witticism which could only be appreciated anyway if one had read the five articles about metrics on the reading list.

Joan, who had been one of the brightest undergraduates, was waiting on tables at the Dandale; her husband was still in graduate school, though he did not go to classes very often, having discovered much earlier than most the term "irrelevant." Yet she never mentioned exchanging responsibilities, even though she still nostagically found seventeenth century literature "relevant" and even exciting. Jim and Louise valiantly tried to split financial obligations: they had agreed that it was only fair that each should bring in an equal amount of money a week. This took Louise considerably more hours since she worked in a cafeteria while Jim had a job in a lab. After their baby was born, they visited Jim's sister, a messianic housewife in Cleveland Heights. She preached the power of sexual surrender to Louise, who was in a susceptible state because the baby and the housekeeping were her happy privileges to relax with after part-time classes and longer working hours. She decided to forget that she was getting straight A's for the sake of greater serenity. At any rate, Jim would now undoubtedly start getting A's or at least B's. Ruth, Sandy, Marilyn, Betty — our liveliest female friends — had not even struggled for a year as Louise had.

We made new friends and because there were plenty of single women graduate students in the English department, the sexual imbalance was not striking. We even knew two other couples like us who were going to graduate school together. One of them worried constantly about the psychic wound which would be inflicted if she got an A in Chaucer (as seemed likely) if her husband didn't. But it turned out fine after all: she wrote his paper as well as her own.

We were hopelessly innocent. When we considered our female friends, we occasionally blamed their husbands for being selfish or themselves for not persisting. We explained or apologized for ourselves: Harry was good at cooking; Agate had spent her childhood in Europe during the war and consequently thought that education was the only possession one could always carry along. We gave other reasons. To be engaged in the same pursuits was good for our marriage because we would not grow apart. (This went over fairly well in the era of togetherness, though it was taken to be a somewhat eccentric interpretation.) Our being in school was good for our son since we could both spend time with him. (This was regarded with some skepticism and tentative questions about possible damage to his masculinity.) But never did we simply say, we *liked* what we were doing, and that was sufficient. We did not really consider the assumption hinted at all around us: women should choose between marriage and education, between careers and families.

How naive we were became obvious when our borrowing capacity ran out and we had to find jobs shortly after completing our M.A.'s. In 1962, plenty of jobs were available for people with advanced degrees in English, but not for two people in the same school, let alone in the same department. We received and disconsolately threw away about forty letters offering to interview or hire either one of us, but never, never both. One chair obligingly explained that a married couple would always vote on the same side of every departmental issue — amazing because he was married himself, though perhaps he only meant the husband's side of every issue. Finally we arrived in Wisconsin. Harry would teach at Whitewater; Agate would either go to school or find a job nearby. Both of us could work on our Ph.D.'s at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, now within commuting distance and the most enlightened institution in the midwest, perhaps in the United States.

Not entirely, of course. Since Harry had accepted a job first, Agate hastily applied for a teaching assistantship at UW-Madison. She received it along with a P.S. of unsolicited advice: since it had been noted that her husband was in English as well, she should understand that if she accepted the assistantship, he would never be eligible for like consideration. But a job at UW-Milwaukee paid better, even though men with similar qualifications received well over a thousand dollars more. Perhaps they had more children and perhaps the department just did not like her. At any rate, it was not very important since the next year President Wyman at Wisconsin State University-Whitewater decided to do the unthinkable: hire two married people in the same department in spite of such immense potential dangers as a two-person block vote.

UW-Madison remained the ideal place to get Ph.D.'s for both of us. The question of assistantships never arose again, since having learned to take turns caring for the baby, we continued taking turns going to school, studying for prelims, writing dissertations, and working. Being denied the right to live in Eagle Heights during the 1966-67 academic year when it was Agate's turn to go to school was the other time our sense of an enlightened academic community was significantly shaken again. We were told that "the head of the household" was not a student, but was teaching. (So, of course, were the spouses of many male graduate students living there.) By now, however, we had read *The Second Sex* and *The Feminine Mystique* and we did not brood that the university might not like us. Instead, we received our Ph.D.'s within six months of each other in 1972, and we remember our professors for their kindness and fairness. The sexist assumptions of the 1950s and 1960s had only touched us, but not stopped us. They did, however, stop or slow down many capable women and even those few husbands who were prepared to sacrifice some of their "natural" prerogatives to academic careers.

12. We Have Hired Couples for Years

by Nancy Newell Moore

When the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's *Higher Education Guidelines* enforcing Executive Order #11246 came out in 1972, those of us at the University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point noted with pride that our institution had no anti-nepotism policy as was forbidden in the guidelines. In fact, we had hired couples as faculty for years! But most faculty, particularly members of couples, were familiar with the problem the guidelines addressed: "Because men have traditionally been favored in employment over women, anti-nepotism regulations in most cases operate to deny employment opportunity to a wife."[1] Many couples had come here because this institution was one of the few willing to consider members of couples for employment on an equal basis.

That the writers of the guidelines felt that discrimination against wives had to be addressed suggested that anti-nepotism policies and practices were generally pervasive in the early 1970s. Even though the law now forbids these policies and practices, it cannot easily and suddenly alter traditional attitudes about hiring couples. But are there good reasons for excluding couples, particularly if they are in the same department? At a time when most universities avoided hiring couples, why did UW-Stevens Point hire a large number of couples and permit tenure-track appointment of both spouses? What has been the experience of UW-Stevens Point with couples, and has the employment of couples been advantageous to the institution? What problems and advantages have couples so employed had?

Ideally, every person, regardless of marital status, should be considered as an individual for employment. Whether his or her spouse is also an applicant for a position should not be a consideration. Likewise, marital status should not be considered in personnel decisions once a couple is employed. But such an ideal cannot be fully attained, though it should be striven towards, because decisions to employ or non-retain have indirect effects on the other spouse. But negative attitudes towards hiring couples seem to have developed before very many couples were employed. Why they developed is not entirely clear. But perhaps their historical antecedents are reflected in the history of hiring practices here at UW-Stevens Point.

Although UW-Stevens Point has been unusually willing to hire couples during the past twenty years, the former president, William A. Hansen (president from 1940-1962), said in a recent interview that he himself did not favor employing couples. His reasons and views of the world may shed some light on the societal objection to doing so in an earlier era. Hansen gave three reasons for opposing hiring couples: (1) unfavorable experience — when one of the couple proves unsatisfactory for some reason, the institution is obliged to keep him or her or risk the wrath of spouse and friends of both; (2) working wives keep teaching salaries down because the husband will be willing to accept a lower salary if his wife can work, too; (3) double incomes create disharmony in the institution because those couples will be "sporting around with extra money," which will create jealously among faculty who have families to support. Hansen said he did not oppose hiring women — he hired many unmarried women — but he did not want to hire wives of faculty.

Probably Hansen's experience as a public school administrator during the Depression shaped his attitude towards hiring married women. In 1932, when he was a school administrator in Stoughton, Wisconsin, he was given the responsibility of terminating the employment of all married women in the school. The firing of married women was a widespread practice during the 1930s throughout the United States because women were thought to be displacing men with families to support.[2] Hence, economic factors served as justification for keeping married women out of the teaching profession, at least in public schools. Various people from different parts of the country have reported that unmarried women teachers of that era often had to choose between salaried spinsterhood and married poverty, for ordinarily the regulation against married women gave no consideration to whether the husband was employed or not.

Hansen's attitude toward hiring couples probably reflects the thinking of many in his generation. Economic equity seemed more important than equality of opportunity (the concept that all applicants and employees be judged on the basis of qualifications and merit, without regard to individual economic need). Even though official university policies now require consideration of qualifications, not need, much of the prejudice against hiring couples probably has roots in this older view.

As economic factors may initially have led to exclusion of couples from consideration for positions during the Depression era, so did economic needs lead to the appointment of couples during the era of rapid institutional growth beginning in the late 1950s here at UW-Stevens Point.[3] President Hansen said he felt no need to employ couples during his administration because there were plenty of qualified men and single women willing to come here during most of the period of his presidency. But even before Hansen retired in 1962, Vice President Gordon Haferbecker sought to solve the faculty shortage problem by seeking qualified people among an often-neglected pool: faculty spouses. Haferbecker began to ask faculty about their spouses' academic qualifications. This information was passed on to hiring units when vacancies developed.

During the late 50s and early 60s, the husband was ordinarily the first employed. (In one instance in 1958, a woman was appointed in psychology and her husband, who was near retirement age, was employed part-time in the same department.) Usually faculty wives were invited to teach at the last minute when more students appeared than were expected. This is how many faculty wives became faculty members. Although many of them remained *ad hoc* faculty, many obtained regular full-time or part-time positions in this way. The pattern for hiring couples was established; many women who had not thought of the possibility of becoming college faculty began to see themselves as such; some of them did more graduate work; many began to think of themselves as professionals once again. And the presence of some couples paved the way for more. More "faculty wives" applied. Then, in 1968, the first dual-career couple was hired. This couple came seeking two tenure-track jobs on equal terms, and both were hired in separate departments. Over the past twenty years, at least forty-five couples have been employed as faculty; twenty-eight are currently employed, thirteen of whom are couples with two

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

full-time tenure-track appointments. Many others have a combination of full and regular part-time positions. Fifty-six of about five hundred fifty current faculty and academic staff are members of faculty couples.

Ten of the thirteen wives among current full-time couples attained full-time tenure-track appointments either by applying or being invited to apply after their husbands were employed here; five received full-time appointments after initial service as *ad hoc* faculty. Three couples entered as dual tenure-track faculty. Of the other fifteen couples, nine of the fifteen wives are regular part-time, the remainder *ad hoc*, but most are employed every semester. (In this institution, all full-time positions are tenure-track, part-time positions may be. Regular part-time people expect to work half-time or more and have pro-rated salaries. *Ad hoc* faculty work as needed but are now paid comparably to regular faculty.)

When couples were first hired, men usually received faculty appointments and their wives taught when and as much as needed, with part-time status and, usually, semester-by-semester appointments. What may be surprising is that many women who began this way eventually became tenure-track faculty. Of the thirteen couples with both spouses currently employed as *full*-time faculty, five include wives who began as part-time with no expectation of tenure. Three of the five now hold administrative staff or line positions: director of the writing lab, student employment coordinator, assistant to the dean. The other two are now completing Ph.D.'s. Nine other women who were once *ad hoc* part-timers now hold regular part-time positions.

What is striking about this pattern, other than the fact that "faculty wives" *can* get genuine faculty positions, is that for many of these women the opportunity to hold faculty positions helped them to think of themselves as professionals, for the first time or once again. This became very clear in the responses in interviews with members of couples. Inspired by opportunity, several of them have become some of the most valued faculty on campus.

The pattern of the husband as the primary worker in the family has remained; in all but three cases, the husband applied for and received a job and the wife sought one afterwards. Many wives had qualifications for positions but waited until their husbands had jobs before seeking jobs themselves because finding even one appointment per couple was difficult. All three couples entering with dual tenure-track appointments came between 1968 and 1971 when positions in their particular fields were not yet scarce. And a large proportion of couples coming after 1967 said that good prospects for dual careers were a factor in their decision to come to UW-Stevens Point. Thus, if the trend is towards dual-career families, to exclude spouses will exclude the possibility of two valuable faculty in many cases. If the trend towards dual-career families continues, as seems likely, the hiring of couples will become increasingly necessary. Ways to better accommodate couples will have to be worked out.

Advantages and Disadvantages to the Institution of Hiring Couples

Members of couples currently employed and administrators overseeing a large number of them were sent questionnaires or interviewed and asked about the advantages and disadvantages to this institution in hiring couples.

Questions were open-ended. Responses were obtained from forty of fifty-six members of couples (twenty-one male, nineteen female) and from eighteen administrators, twelve of whom were chairs or former chairs. All had experience working with members of couples. As Table I indicates, the departments containing the most members of couples are, in descending order: English, history, sociology-anthropology, biology, learning resources, and education. Departments containing couples are English, education, foreign language, music, and sociology-anthropology. English and foreign language have had chairs with spouses in the department.

TABLE I

FACULTY COUPLE DISTRIBUTION BY DEPARTMENT, 1976-77

Column one shows the number of male couple members by department; column two, females' departments. Only departments currently containing members of couples are listed.

MEN	WOMEN
Art (1)	Foreign Language (1)
Biology (4)	Biology (1), Chemistry (1), English (1), Learning Resources (1)
Chemistry (1)	Drama (1)
Communication (2)	English (1), Soc-Anthro (1)
Education (2)	Education (2)
English (3)	English (3)
Foreign Language (1)	Foreign Language (1)
History (8)	Foreign Language (1), Financial Aids (1), Learning Resources (3), Psychology (1), Soc-Anthro (2)
Learning Resources (1)	Soc-Anthro (1)
Music (1)	Music (1)
Natural Resources (2)	English (2)
Soc-Anthro (2)	English (1), Soc-Anthro (1)

Administrators and couples list many of the same advantages and disadvantages to the institution. The reasons both groups listed are very similar to those reported in Pingree and Butler-Paisley's survey of chairs' attitudes towards the professional couple.[4] All but one administrator and one member of a couple believe that overall, hiring couples within the institution has served the institution well or has had no negative effect, though many from both groups also saw some disadvantages to hiring couples. Both groups thought that couples within the university worked out better than couples within one department, especially if the department was small. Many of the perceived advantages and disadvantages listed are mirror images of each other: some perceive the same situation as an advantage while others, often even the same viewer, may see it as a disadvantage. For example, some view the pool of wives as faculty readily available to help when needed; others as faculty vulnerable to exploitation because they are readily available. The most frequently listed advantages to hiring couples may be placed in three categories (listed in descending order): the policy of nepotism enables us to obtain and keep good people, enhances communication among departments and faculty, and provides a pool of part-time help. The most frequently listed categories of disadvantages includes difficulties in personnel decisions, political and social problems because of a couple as a power block, and administrative inconvenience because the couple wishes special considerations. These categories of responses will be developed below.

1. *Nepotism has enabled us to attract and keep good people.* Both administrators and members of couples listed this as a primary advantage to nepotism in the institution. Some cited examples of couples or members of couples whom they considered outstanding. Several couples noted that they would not have come here if there had not been two jobs or the promise of the likelihood of two jobs in the future. Others were attracted by the fact that this institution hires couples. Several other faculty and administrators observed that good people are less likely to move if they find two jobs. Some observed that often the most competent professional people select mates of similar competence; one of them will not come unless the other has work suitable to the qualifications, or if they come for one job, they are less likely to be content here.

2. *Enhances communication among departments and provides personal life-job coherence.* A large number of couples believe that being members of couples makes them better faculty. One couple member comments, "When married couples from different subject areas share and compare views and experiences, their perspective is broadened regarding university policies and practices and they may ultimately grow to make decisions more intelligently." Another notes, "I think knowing problems and frustrations of one another and sharing the pleasures enrich both the job and the marriage. Couples can also learn through vicariously experiencing one another's teaching successes and failures." Many couples echo these sentiments.

Some administrators noted that members of couples often seem to have more involvement in the workings of the university and frequently bring valuable information and understanding from other departments as a consequence of learning from spouses.

3. *Provides a pool of part-time people.* As one respondent said, "There is a community joke that if all the faculty wives stopped working at the university, we would have a major staffing crisis." Many department chairs note that they are highly dependent upon the availability of faculty wives to staff fractional positions and positions created at the last minute. Some chairs say that part-time people are among their best faculty; others note that two half-time people often put in more work than one full-time person could. Several have observed that even though part-time people are now presumably paid comparably to full-time staff, part-time staff have historically been a bargain and still are, because they often do not hold doctorates, have low ranks, and are paid less.

Disadvantages to the Institution in Hiring Couples

1. *Difficulties in personnel decisions about the couple* (appointment of a spouse, retention, tenure, merit, promotion). Both administrators and couple members felt that there were difficulties surrounding personnel decisions about couples, but they did not always agree about the nature of these difficulties. The administrators listed problems of the following sort:

> Hiring of less-qualified people because of their availability or because of pressure from the spouse and the couple's friends to hire a spouse.

> Pressure from another department to hire a spouse so that department can secure someone it wants.
>
> When one couple member leaves or is non-retained, often two are lost. This is not always true, however, for this institution has sometimes lost or non-retained one spouse and kept the other. In one instance, the husband found another job in the community.
>
> When the couple is in the same department, department members often are reluctant to judge each separately. Sometimes one is kept in order to keep the other or to avoid offending the spouse.

From the couple's point of view, the difficulties surrounding personnel decisions are somewhat different. Couples observe and dislike the reluctance of colleagues to consider them as individuals. One respondent said, "Faculty see us as two bodies, one head." Many couples complain that they are assumed to think alike. A few couples noted that there is prejudice against couples which often takes the form of jealousy of their double incomes. Several mentioned that when salaries (merit) are voted on, they are sometimes penalized because of jealousy of their double income.

Prejudice against couples within a department seems to be even more severe. One respondent felt that she nearly was denied tenure simply because she was married to a member of her department.

Paradoxically, the system's nepotism policy, which was designed to prevent personnel problems affecting couples, received many negative comments from couples. This policy, which forbids one spouse's participation in personnel decisions involving the other, is considered unfair because it limits those who are married while others who share economic and/or emotional ties are not so limited. One member of a couple notes, "I feel strongly that it limits seriously the rights of the affected persons. In matters of merit or in matters where a ranked ballot is used, the married couple simply loses votes since 'spice' are forbidden to vote on each other. I hope that someday a cronyism rule will be enacted forbidding any persons who have been cronies for more than a year. . .to formally or informally participate in any personnel decision concerning the other!" Other members of couples and administrators have pointed out that close friends, business partners, housemates, and homo- or hetero-sexual lovers who live together make personnel decisions affecting each other while persons married are forbidden to do so. "This matter should not to be taken lightly for it has far-reaching implications about department growth and development," says one respondent. A large number of respondents assert that all groups with business or emotional ties should be treated in a parallel manner.

In many cases, the second one of a couple employed (usually the wife), felt that she was given second-class status and, sometimes, lower salary or rank than she would have had, had she been employed alone. One full-timer said she did not feel free to ask for the rank her husband negotiated for himself, though she had equal qualifications. "Initially, I didn't feel what you might call wanted," said another. A former department chairman's wife, who came in part-time in another department, said, "My department viewed me, if at all, as a 'part-timer' and the administration looked upon me as the chairman's wife, a jolly hostess. . . . What continues to concern me. . .is the. . .'stigma" attached to the status of part-timer. . . . You get the sense that somehow you are of lesser ability, lesser intelligence, etc. And, interestingly enough, this stigma remains after you've gone into full-time."

2. *Political and social problems.* One department chair claims that couples, even when in different departments, often vote on issues in a way to please the spouse or benefit the spouse's departmental interests. The "couple-as-power-block" in a department is often mentioned as a problem. The couple in one department is generally feared, often even by department chairs who have had no experience with a department couple. However, the couple is not usually feared so much because of its voting power as its potential as a source of discontent. Several administrators complained that couples — married and unmarried — take spouse's or lover's parts in disputes, for example. Members of couples, on the other hand, claim that fear of them as a power block, especially if they are in one department, is a problem. One respondent said, "There are faculty members who, being insecure anyway, actually fear a married couple attaining some kind of awesome power. Don't ask me to explain it." One member of a couple mentioned that she felt that she had to be silent when she would have spoken if she were a single person because of departmental fears of this "power block."

A few administrators alluded to political/social problems of the opposite sort: problems when couples divorce. (Five faculty couples have divorced; four of the couples worked in the same department. In three of five cases, both spouses have stayed at UW-Stevens Point.) Some administrators felt the divorces caused no special problems for the institution; others felt personal marital problems spilled over into professional life, creating political/social problems (such as how to treat each other) and lowering professional performance, at least temporarily.

3. *Desire for special consideration.* Administrators claim couples desire special consideration so that they can coordinate their leaves, overseas assignments, class schedules, and summer teaching commitments. However, only three administrators mentioned this as a possible problem, and two of the three said that they had been able to work around this potential problem because of the cooperation of other faculty. For example, faculty in the learning resource center cooperate in arranging their schedules so that those desiring vacations with teaching-faculty spouses during student vacations can take them. Other department chairs schedule faculty so one or the other can be home half days with children. Although "special considerations" are feared, in fact creative accommodations are possible with little inconvenience to anyone.

In spite of the above perceived disadvantages to hiring couples, the overriding sentiment of respondents seems to be that hiring couples is a good idea. Prejudice against couples must not be very strong, for almost all members of couples felt that one of a married pair in their department (assuming a couple was employed in their department) could be nominated and appointed as chairperson. If couples were considered a serious problem, members of couples probably would not anticipate this as a possibility.

Advantages and Disadvantages of Nepotism to the Couple

Almost all of the couples and many of the administrators thought the advantages to the couple — both professional and personal — greatly outweighed the disadvantages. Among the advantages are personal life-job coherence, mutual intellectual stimulation, both working in the area for which each is trained, coordinating professional and personal needs and financial advantage. One faculty member, whose wife began teaching here many years after he did, wrote "The money advantage is not the primary thing. I am convinced that as satisfied adults, both sharing our university experiences, we have become collectively more than two. I would say the university has gained by a factor of two!"

The disadvantages mentioned are: reduced mobility (this may hamper professional growth of one or both), loss of separate identity and problems associated with being evaluated with or in comparison to the other, lower salary and status for the second-employed spouse, discrimination against couples because of jealousy of double income or fear of them as a power block, possible marital problems created or aggravated by blending job and personal life. However, of the thirty-nine members of couples responding to the question, "Do you think having a spouse employed here has at any time been a barrier...to opportunities or benefits [to you]?" only eight (three male, five female) responded affirmatively. Six of those were persons in the same department as their spouse. More thought that being a couple in the same university was beneficial. Some thought it had no effect at all.

Recommendations

Because dual-career families are becoming more commonplace, institutions and couples may be interested in suggestions from those at UW-Stevens Point who have had experience with and as couples:

> Emphasize that members of couples are individuals, each deserving fair consideration. Personnel decisions should be made on each on the basis of merit. Members of couples must accept the possibility that both may not be hired or that one or both will not be retained.
>
> Members of couples should work to establish individual professional identities. Each should emphasize how each is different from the spouse.
>
> Members of couples should maintain the highest standards of professional ethics. Their actions will be scrutinized and they will serve as a basis for generalizations about the behavior of other couples. They must avoid any action which might be construed as conflict of interest, refuse to fight battles for a spouse, ask for no special considerations beyond what other faculty request.
>
> Emphasize the strengths couples can offer: teamwork possibilities, greater professional involvement because of job-life coherence, improved communication and shared knowledge, and a more stable faculty.

Prejudice has emphasized problems couples can create; the strengths couples can bring to an institution deserve equal time.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 12

1. The *Guidelines* sought to forbid the denying of "the *opportunity* for employment, advancement, or benefits on the basis of an anti-nepotism rule or practice," but permitted "institutional regulations which set reasonable restrictions on an individual's capacity to function as judge or advocate in specific situations involving a member of his or her immediate family" if "they do not have the effect of denying equal employment opportunity to one sex or the other." (*HEW Higher Education Guidelines*, pp. 8 and 9)
2. Caroline Bird, *Born Female* (New York: D. McKay Company, 1968, p.31)
3. This campus grew from under 1,000 students in 1955 to 1,800 in 1960, 3,900 in 1965 and 8,700 in 1970. Well-qualified faculty were hard to attract between 1960 and 1970. Then, around 1970, qualified applicants began to exceed needs in many disciplines.
4. Suzanne Pingree and Matilda Butler-Paisley, "Attitudes toward Hiring Professional Couple: Results of a Recent Survey." Paper presented at the Symposium on Academic/Professional Women in Communication at International Communication Association, April 18, 1974. The authors sent an open-ended questionnaire to chairs of sociology and psychology departments in the U.S., then compiled a list of advantages and disadvantages to hiring couples that chairs had listed.

13. The President's Wife: A Changing Role

Observations of a Chancellor's Wife

by Judith T. Guskin

There is a growing desire on the part of those fulfilling the role of the wife of a university president to re-define that role, clarify expectations held by boards of trustees, examine the variety of patterns currently existing and find support for new options. Presidents' wives of all ages have begun to enter into dialogue with each other and their spouses at the annual conferences of higher education associations about how they balance their desire to make contributions to their spouses' jobs, the campuses and communities they are part of, and their own personal and professional growth.

Much has been written about the changing nature of higher education in the eighties, including the increase in adult women students, but little has been said about the changes brought about by the increase in women faculty and administrators, dual-career academic families, the role of women on boards of trustees, or the changing role of presidents' wives. There are few forums for honest discussions about these issues, and we cope as best we can with conflicts that emerge over affirmative action controversies, the strains of career choices in a time of declining options, the problems faced by the few women in high administrative positions as they relate to both men and women on the campus, and other dilemmas that we as members of the academic community find ourselves currently facing because, in addition to being academics, we are also men and women. We make countless personal and professional decisions while wondering whether others are facing these same conflicts.

We have learned over the last decade that *general* statements about accepting options for women tell us little about the changes that occur in the *feelings* and *behavior* of women and those who live and work with them. Our movies, novels, and social service agencies are attempting to clarify inconsistencies in expectations and the strains that choices produce as women try to balance what they want with what they perceive others expect of them. Most of the focus has been on the institution of the family, abortion, and the ERA. While these are critical issues, there also is need to focus on the effects of changes in women's roles on organizations. Searching for instances of sexism and bringing these to public attention is only part of what is needed. Understanding the impact of changes currently taking place within women and men, how they feel and behave, is also essential if organizational and personal conflicts are to be resolved in ways that enhance the lives of both men and women as well as improve their work in organizations.

A chief executive clearly has a major impact on his organization and a chief executive's wife clearly has a major impact on his personal satisfaction, his ability to cope with the stresses of his job, and often his public image. Like it or not, the wife is considered part of the "team," and is a public figure. How a woman feels about her role, and what she does or does not do, will affect the executive, and will be discussed by others. A university president's wife shares this aspect of her role with wives of community leaders, politicians, and even the wife of the nation's highest elected official. It is a demanding role, and one often added to the roles of housewife, mother, professional, and community leader of "causes" that interest her as an individual. How long she has been at the "balancing act," how much she likes the many publics she must interact with, how stressful the job is for her husband, and her relationship with her husband, all affect her ability to cope with the stresses and opportunities provided by the role. Her satisfaction will affect his satisfaction.

What are the traditional dimensions of the role? The simplest way to express it is that she is to enhance the social role of president. As the president's constituents are many, this usually means she is hostess to numerous faculty and their spouses, students, business leaders, legislators, trustees and visiting dignitaries. She is expected to attend many campus and community functions every year, and is often asked to serve on community boards, participate in and contribute to fund raising efforts for worthy community agencies, and volunteer her home for meetings.

The issue of a large, university-owned house and its use is often a source of concern. It is seen as the stage upon which the president's wife is to play her role with charm and cooperativeness, not as a retreat from the stress of public life, or a home to be used and abused by children, dogs, friends, and relatives. Some boards, faculty, and community members may see it as her reward for working as part of a "two-person career," as Corbally[1] has described the role. To many presidents' wives, the official home is a very mixed blessing. It may generate envy and it does not generate equity. The board of trustees will ask her to see it during the selection process, but not ask if she wants it. It is the setting in which she is to play her expected social role.

Muriel Beadle, wife of a former president of the University of Chicago, was not only speaking for herself but for many others when she wrote of her feelings upon returning home with her husband after their meeting with the governing board:

> "For my part, the idea of running that house was appalling. A thousand faculty wives to get to know. Eight thousand students. Goodness knows what other responsibilities. At Caltech, I had observed Doris DuBridge's activities with sympathy, and I doubted that I could be as consistently nice as she was to people I didn't like very much. Given my inability to dissemble, I'd surely lose the university some multi-million-dollar gift by insulting a potential donor. I am an activist; could I restrict myself to non-controversial kinds of activisim? And I detest cocktail parties. What the University of Chicago needed, I was thinking as we flew back to California that night, was a First Lady who had more social savvy than I had."[2]

Of course, some people do like cocktail parties and meeting scores of new people. For many women, in fact, the role of a president's wife fits very well with their own desires and abilities. They take pride in being a gracious hostess in lovely surroundings. They feel that their efforts enhance their husband's job. They enjoy the voluntary activities they are asked to participate in, and see themselves as bridging the proverbial gap between "town" and "gown." There may be some frustrations with the local campus' food service, or the inability to get adequate maintenance on their house from overloaded physical plant staff, or scheduling conflicts, but all in all the role provides them with opportunities for a busy and interesting life. They may wish for more appreciation for their efforts, but even though this is not forthcoming, they know that they are making a contribution to the campus, the community, and the state. In fact, they may enjoy the role so much that leaving the role, when the president moves or retires, poses problems.

Even if the "fit" between the traditional expectations and the wishes of the president's wife is a good one, there are factors which cause a need for adjustment and choices that need to be made by both members of the "presidential team." The size and location of the campus can affect each of them in different ways. While he may like a large campus, she may find the complexity more difficult. The campus may be small, just what he wants, but it may be located in a very small town and she may have problems with local gossip and lack of privacy; she may miss big city opportunities for enrichment or professional advancement. The campus town may be an ideal place to raise their children, or it may pose problems. Although many couples have to face multiple factors about where they live and work, there are aspects of these problems that are related to the public roles presidents and their families play. Also, since her husband may be moving fairly often (the average presidency being five years), and since the choices may be few, she may feel somewhat trapped by the circumstances if not the substance of the role. Moves do not provide her with advancement and greater professional development. They mean instead a shift in living circumstances that may or may not prove satisfactory.

Many presidents' wives are not satisfied being unpaid adjuncts of their husbands, since they have had careers of their own. They know that they have the ability to develop professionally, but may not have the opportunity on this campus or in this town to do so. The adjustments that have to be made to accommodate the career aspirations of both husband and wife may not be easy. Some of them are common to all dual-career families and include concerns about child care and the maintenance of the everyday management of a household, the attitudes of family and friends, the lack of leisure time, the combined stresses brought into a household from two work settings, and the strain on people and cars of extra commuting. Dual-career families have different patterns, and some of these have been described by researchers.[3] Some of the stress that the president and his wife experience are common to these families. Some of them are related to the very demanding role of the president and the expectations he and others hold for the role of his wife.

An important factor is whether or not the couple has reached agreement about the professional involvement of both persons. Dual-career marriages increase the need for compromise and support. Adding such demands to the hectic lifestyle of the president and his family must be accompanied by additional actions as well as expressions of support and encouragement. If the presidency comes after a pattern of dual-career marriage has been established, there is an expectation on the part of the wife that this will continue. Prior experience helps somewhat in that coping strategies have been worked out, although unexpected events that always produce their share of chaos — a sick child, a conflict in scheduling, car brakes that need fixing, the failure of a colleague to do what was expected — may produce greater likelihood that plans will need changing if they are now a presidential couple.

Opportunities for employment or professional educational advancement for the wife may pose very difficult problems. Often commuting long distances is involved, and they cannot choose to live "in-between." The commitment to the job or education needs to be strong, and the support a wife gets at home becomes essential for survival. Education or employment on his campus is also possible, but this means that the faculty and the president's wife need to be clear about the dual roles involved. She cannot be a messenger for her husband, should not gossip or become very involved in governance issues that might lead to conflict, and needs to gain the respect of her colleagues for what she has to offer as a professional. Friendships with non-tenured faculty could be tricky if conflict becomes involved. Some wives have provided their professional talents *gratis*, but others are not comfortable with this. It should not be expected. If a wife is successful in combining her professional life with her social life by working on the same campus or in the same town, the friendships can be deeper and the conflicts of scheduling and commuting less difficult. Some of the energy draining aspects of a dual-career situation will be lessened.

With over 42 million women working today, the question of community attitudes toward a working president's wife is generally less of a problem than it has been in the past. Many community leaders have wives who work, or wives who are going back to school, so they are not very surprised to learn that the president's wife is employed. Their wives do not always accompany them to all business functions, so they can understand scheduling conflicts that may arise, or the need to spend time with children. Boards usually include women who have professional identities themselves or have been in leadership positions in their communities. Many more faculty wives work, as do alumni. In fact, if the president's wife has an education and position that merits respect, this will be acknowledged by both the men and women she interacts with when she is performing the usual hostess functions of the president's wife.

Working wives who have careers bring good things to their marriages, their families, and the people with whom they interact. The energy demands are great, but if they have satisfying jobs, they find that additional interests and feelings of pride in accomplishment generate energy. They are happier people and this is likely to increase the president's satisfaction at home.

Finally, it is important to remember that it is the *president's* job to lead the university. His personal life needs to be satisfying so that he can do a good job, but it is *his* job, not hers. The president's wife can support him, but it is his ability to lead, to work effectively with his team of top administrators, and to relate to the many publics of his job, that determine his success or failure. Whether or not his wife fits the traditional role of hostess, he must know about budgets and how to handle retrenchment in ways that protect academic quality and the long term interests of his university. No one wants his wife to become involved in the substance of his job, and she should not. If she understands the issues facing higher education in the 1980s, she can be a sounding board who can be trusted to keep confidences, a valuable function that an intelligent woman can provide to her husband. The president may read his speeches to his wife, or ask her to go to an event for him if he cannot attend.

The partnership of the president and his wife may not be obvious to others, but it may be strong in ways that support his ability to handle the stress of his job, and to think through his options before he has to make difficult decisions. He benefits if his wife can make a good impression on people, cook fancy meals, and enjoys cocktail parties and local service club banquets. He also benefits if she is feeling happy, is developing her talents, and is growing as an independent person with a life of her own. She will have her own problems to share, but his problems will not become all that she knows and cares about.

In fact, since it is not her job to solve his problems, and she has no public role to do so, if she does not have a life of her own, all she has is the stress of the job without the feeling of accomplishment.

Eleanor Roosevelt once said that somewhere along the line of development we discover who we really are and make decisions for which we alone are responsible, about how to lead our lives. We cannot lead anyone else's life, neither that of our child nor our husband, but we can positively influence the lives of those around us as we continue to grow and develop. Whether the president's wife decides that she finds the traditional role of hostess fulfilling or wishes to modify that role, it should be a thoughtful decision that involves discussion with her family. Being a president's wife does provide her with some opportunities to grow and to enjoy life, but it may not be enough for some women. As with all changes in the role of women, changing the expectations others hold for her and she holds for herself are both necessary. How she resolves the issues that she perceives will affect not only her personal satisfaction but those of her husband and children. It will affect her life on the job if she works, and it may affect some aspects of his work. But, as Gibran the poet once said, a marriage is a temple held up by two independent columns, both separate and mutually supporting.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 13

1. For a detailed study of the satisfactions and frustrations of presidents' wives, see: Corbally, Maragarita Walker, *The Partners: Sharing the Life of the College President* (Danville, Illinois: Interstate, 1977).
2. Beadle, Muriel, *Where Has All the Joy Gone* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1972), p. 5. As quoted in: Joseph F. Kauffman, *At the Pleasure of the Board* (Washington, D.C.: ACE, 1980), p. 85.
3. See *Dual Career Families Re-examined: New Integrations of Work and Family* (Rhona and Robert Rapoport, New York: Harper, 1976).

14. Child Care and the University

by Irene Kiefer

"Doubt not the ability of small and isolated groups of 'powerless' women to cause change in great bureaucracies." If there is an axiom made evident by the late 1960s and early 1970s era of the women's movement it may be this.

Within the University of Wisconsin System, women began to exercise their abilities in new and vigorous ways during that time. And those ways included grass roots action to establish the first campus-based child care centers in the UW System. It was in July of 1970 when Dorothy Austin, a reporter, wrote in an article in the *Milwaukee Sentinel*:

> It remained for a women's liberation group to accomplish what many women have talked about for years, a free day care center, believed to be the first of its kind in this area.
>
> The women chose the name SHREW, Sisters Helbenton Relevant Educational Welfare.
>
> Its location on the UWM (University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee) campus is almost ideal, a basement room in Vogel Hall and adjacent fenced-in playground. True, the center could use more room, but considering the space squeeze at the university, the day care center's operators feel that the university has been responsive to a long existing need, and generous.
>
> The future of the center is far from clear. It is rich in volunteers, with about four adults or young adults to every child enrolled, but poor financially.
>
> The university has made no commitment of space for fall, nor is there any money thus far for continuance in fall. Yet some mothers have registered for courses in hope that the center will be able to continue.[1]

Austin's observations about the future came to pass and SHREW failed financially before the end of the year. But SHREW had contributed to the total picture. Its existence demonstrated the need for day care — a need brought about as women sought freedom to choose their own roles in life, greater participation in the work force and more opportunities for training and enrichment on the nation's campuses. SHREW showed that students supported day care concepts. And, by its failure, SHREW underlined the necessity of the university's involvement in day care programs to insure success. For the university, the principle reason for committing resources to child care services involves the recognition that such services enable certain classes of students to enroll at the university who otherwise might not be able to attend. Such services are fundamental, in light of the changes occurring in the makeup of the student population.[2]

By September of 1971, UW-Milwaukee had another child care center on campus, this one financed by gifts and grants. The center operated within the department of student activities. The director was Pamela Boulton, who had returned to UW-Milwaukee as an adult student in the master's degree program in education.

Four months later, in January of 1972, UW-Oshkosh opened a center on campus under sponsorship of the Associated Women Students. Leslie Holten was AWS president that year and Gloria Keyes was the first administrator of the UW-Oshkosh center. UW-Green Bay — which now serves 110 children and is second in size only to UW-Milwaukee with 300 — opened its on-campus center the following fall (September, 1972).

Like others both before and after, the Green Bay center had its start as the dream of one woman who rallied support and served as the banner bearer. She was Dianne Wistert (Wisty) Rorabacher, a twenty-two year old woman new to the Green Bay area.

"It was the first time in my married life that I had ventured out and done something," Rorabacher now says. What she did was to plant the idea of day care at the UW-Green Bay campus and nurture that idea in the almost weekly meetings held during that first, crucial year of planning.

For Rorabacher the story began in 1969, shortly after her arrival in Green Bay. She recalls:

> I read something about the growing number of women returning to campus to obtain degrees. It was exciting to think that women with children could return to school. Day care was a new idea then, radical, but not so radical that I couldn't handle it. It seemed to be a non-threatening way of being involved in the women's movement. For those of us who could not yet articulate our feminist feelings, it was an acceptable cause. In retrospect, I think it was 'safe' to be working for a child's right to quality day care; it would have been too threatening to have been working for my own rights.

But she was to find campus-based day care not always a popular cause. "One faculty wife I approached on the subject told me I was out of line for even suggesting it," Rorabacher says. "She indicated that I had no right to think I could ask 'the university' to do anything."

Supporters, on the other hand, promoted campus-based day care as a legitimate student service which, like financial aid or tutoring programs, would enable certain students — those having pre-school children — to continue their educations.

The time was right and the idea would not be denied. One by one, friends offered Rorabacher their encouragement and approval. Then she found an ally inside the institution. She was Marge Engelman, director of adult education and advisor to the UW-Green Bay chancellor on the status of women. The encounter was timely, for Engelman herself had recently started to think about the possibility of a child care facility at UW-Green Bay.

"In working with returning adults, I kept hearing women say they were ready to return to school and interested in doing so, but couldn't because of child care responsibilities," Engelman says. "Only one day care center was operating in Green Bay at that time, and that was for disadvantaged children. It seemed obvious that the campus needed a center where children could be cared for on a part-time and drop-in basis to enable their parents to attend classes and have time alone to study."

What was "obvious" to Engelman wasn't always so clear to colleagues with whom she spoke: "I heard all the old arguments and I was told in no uncertain terms that there was no way a university would ever support a day care center."

The meeting of the two women was to prove the turning point. "We were both looking for support for the idea," Rorabacher says, "and each got it from the other." Help was needed, and on October 11, 1971, a public meeting was held at the campus to gauge interest in a child care center and enlist workers.

Among those who attended was Bonnie Anderson, a student and the mother of a young son. "We couldn't have been planning a center at a better time," Anderson says. "The women's movement was just coming into being and was catching the academic community by surprise. We used all the arguments of the movement. . .and they were persuasive arguments that many liberal thinkers couldn't in good conscience go against."

Particularly effective was the argument that the absence of part-time, low-cost child care effectively closed education to women, especially the poor and those from minority groups.

Anderson notes that the day care concept also had an unexplored but inherent place in the UW-Green Bay academic plan. It fit well with the UW-Green Bay thinking on developmental psychology, early childhood education and community outreach, for example.

Also at the charter meeting was Lorna Aaronson, a young faculty wife who had early joined the campaign for a day care center: "Looking back at the group, I can see that we were pretty well split between those who were approaching the project in terms of the feminist movement and those who were much less involved in that scene. Actually, the committee was something of an early consciousness raising group — we stuck to the task, but there was a lot of exploration of our own feelings along the way."

The tasks the group set for itself included finding physical space for a center, making lists of appropriate non-sexist materials, developing formal statements of purpose and philosophy, and finding funds. "We worked, really worked, both as individuals and as a group," Aaronson says, "but at no time was it exhausting or boring. I don't remember being drained. What I do remember is the exhilaration of exploring these matters with a group of bright, thinking young women."

Aaronson was deeply involved in developing the statement of philosophy:[3] "It was very important to us. We spent a lot of time trying to anticipate the problems that might come up and make appropriate provisions. And as a cooperative, the philosophy had to reflect the personalities and values of the people involved, since we were, in effect, the first parent group. Complicating that was our strong belief that the center had to be capable of evolving rather quickly to reflect the values of future, emerging parent groups.

"Structurally, the center was always meant to be a parent cooperative and to provide drop-in service. We wanted a university-based center that would be partly funded by the university and on university property. The original emphasis was toward facilitating the return of women to school, but we soon realized that it must also be a place where fathers were involved."

Resistance, Aaronson says, was subtle: "I can best remember one man saying after a meeting, 'My wife has survived all these years paying fifty cents an hour.' His implication was, of course, that we were seeking an unneeded and frivolous service."

Nicki Yarbrough, who chaired the first board of directors of the center, recalls, "Everyone was very polite and let us say our piece. The arguments I heard were never philosophical. They had to do with pragmatic things — lack of money, lack of space."

Anne Smith, another committee member, says, "The general attitude of the administrators was that no one cared one way or another. They would go along with it if it could be worked out, but would not provide any particular assistance."

So work it out they did.

Harriet Edelstein had recently moved to Green Bay from the University of California at Riverside where she had been involved in opening a day care center. (Edelstein had, in fact, learned of Rorabacher's plans before leaving California, and arrived ready to work.) Ann Cliadakis, another faculty wife new to the campus, provided leadership in developing the non-sexist materials list for the proposed center. Lee Lehman, a student from Stevens Point, took the liaison role between the committee and student government and was successful in lobbying for student fee funds.

The list continued to grow.

"Enthusiasm for the day care center," says Bonnie Anderson, "was contagious. The more we communicated our ideas, the more confidence we found in the group and the concept."

Within weeks of the original committee gathering, Engelman and Rorabacher were presenting the proposal to Chancellor Edward W. Weidner. Weidner assured his callers that he supported the idea. He also reminded them of the space problems at UW-Green Bay, then the newest unit in the UW System. With the new campus still under construction, the university was housed partially in the building that had been the old two-year center in the city and partially on the bayshore campus near the city limits. A number of offices, including the chancellor's, were in converted cottages and farm houses surrounding the building site.

Weidner gave the committee authority to move ahead, charging the group with surveying the exact need for a child care center on campus and searching for funds and facilities. By early 1972 the committee was ready to respond formally to Weidner.

Accompanying a resolution that a center be opened the following September were statistics indicating that in one survey forty-two families had expressed interest in using a center. These families — from among the eighty-seven queried — could account for sixty children and approximately 490 child care hours per week. The document also advised officials of the institution to look about them in the hallways and lounges of UW-Green Bay.

Those who did look saw babies — from infants sleeping in backpacks to five-year-olds climbing over couches and under chairs. It was a spontaneous demonstration on behalf of child care, and it couldn't have been more persuasive if it had been planned. In retrospect, the children probably reflected the increasing number of married students at UW-Green Bay (about one-fourth of the population by the spring of 1972) and the increasing speculation among student parents that a day care center would open soon.

Whatever the causes, children were being brought to campus. Most were cared for by other parents or students who were between classes. Some children were simply taken into the lecture halls where they slept or played.

In December, 1971, the UW-Green Bay Student Government Council had unanimously approved a request for $2,500 for equipment and supplies. The following February, the council allocated an additional $9,740 to cover the operating costs for the center's first year. With funding in hand, the committee set about the task which would, according to many, be its greatest success — the hiring of a director.

"We didn't realize the significance at the time," Rorabacher says, "but the chancellor gave the committee clearance to do the recruiting and select a candidate, pending his approval." The woman selected was Dorothy Stark Parsons.

Marge Engelman notes, "The hiring of Dorothy was a stroke of genius. She had a degree in public administration. She knew UW-Green Bay from attending the campus as an older adult student in growth and development. She herself had been a working mother. And she was unbelievably creative in her approach to obtaining materials and equipment that we did not have."

Parsons, a native of Kansas, had graduated from the University of California at Los Angeles in 1947. She had worked in industry, doing personnel work, company advertising, counseling and payroll. She had served as a nursery school teacher in the Kansas City Cooperative Preschool (but had to leave the job after one year because she couldn't arrange child care for her own youngsters). She was program director of the Title I preschool for rural disadvantaged four-year-olds in New Holstein, Wisconsin. Parsons herself says, "I've been thankful for everything I ever learned. . .and I've had to use it all here."

With only one crucial barrier remaining, Wisty Rorabacher and her husband left Green Bay for Minneapolis, Minnesota, where he would work.

"I left in August of 1972," Rorabacher says, "and we still had no facility. The committee — which had remained pretty calm during the preceding months — was upset. Most of us felt we were getting the runaround, and that progress could have been hastened if it were for a more 'desirable' project."

A cottage on university land had been selected for the center. But the remodeling work was far behind schedule. Each passing day brought greater frustration and anger for the committee, which could not advertise the availability of child care until an opening date was firm. At that point, Nicki Yarbrough says, "we were operating with a determination fueled by anger."

Two weeks before classes were to start, Chancellor Weidner, concerned that the center could not open on schedule, arranged to vacate a building being rented near the campus. The cavernous, brick facility dated from the turn of the century, and had last served as an extended-care nursing home.

"There was an unbelievable splurge of activity to get that place cleaned and ready for the children," Engelman recalls "It had drawbacks — high ceilings, no carpeting, austerity. But in many ways it was an ideal place. It was big and open and there was a sunporch where the children did art projects. The wide main hall became a tricycle path. . .you had to be careful not to get run over." Despite late advertising, forty-one children were enrolled that fall.

Ten weeks after school started, work was finished on the cottage and the UW-Green Bay Day Care Center moved to its present location. Operation has been continuous since that time. But the sailing has not always been smooth.

As enrollment has increased, the size of the facility has expanded, first by conversion of the garage, then by winterizing a summer porch. Countless other projects have sapped time and energy, as the staff and volunteers have negotiated for maintenance and construction that would enhance the program for children or help to meet fire and building codes.

"We might not have survived at all," Parsons says, "if it had not been for Marge Engelman and Chancellor Weidner, who have continually given us moral support, found additional funds, and spoken on our behalf."

Having to operate on a shoestring budget has led to a sometimes humorous, if not ludicrous, lifestyle at the center. For the first year Parsons did her paperwork on a five dollar Underwood typewriter she had purchased. "It was thirties vintage," Parsons says, "a good decade for wines, but a bad one for typewriters."

During the 1973-74 school year the UW-Green Bay physical plant operation started charging the center for garbage collection. The fee was applicable because the center was only an auxiliary service, a "renter."

"We felt we couldn't afford the charge," Parsons says, "so we decided to haul the trash away ourselves. Every parent who left was given a bag of garbage and wet diapers to take home. We even gave garbage to visitors who had just stopped in to look us over."

UW-Milwaukee, UW-Oshkosh and now UW-Green Bay had child care facilities on campus. Other units in the UW System were studying existing programs and alternatives. And in April of 1974, the UW Board of Regents adopted the policy on equal opportunity in education, which includes in its guidelines the statement:

> As an alternative to community day care, when community care does not adequately meet the needs of the campus, each university should set a goal of seeing that top quality, low-cost day care and extended day care services, preferrably campus based, are available to students with young children as well as to faculty and staff.[4]

By 1975-76 more than a dozen UW campuses provided child care programs.[5] More than one thousand children were served.

"It's still a day-to-day scramble to make ends meet," Parsons says. "Many administrators around the state continue to view child care as 'just another student service.' Some continue to say, 'Why make a big deal out of caring for little children. Anyone can babysit.' But the one group that really wants quality day care — the mothers — have made it a reality."

The second era of campus child care opened in April of 1976, when representatives of several university child care centers met in Stevens Point. Just three years earlier, a proposed meeting between supervisors and board members from UW-Milwaukee, UW-Green Bay and UW-Oshkosh was squelched by recommendations from administrators that it was not the time to be "rocking the boat."

A second meeting was held in July of 1976 in Eau Claire. From that session was developed the paper, "University of Wisconsin System Child Care Services,"[6] urging a systemwide day care policy and threshold financial support for child care services on all campuses.

As it was in 1970 when Dorothy Austin wrote about SHREW, "The future. . .is far from clear." But UW child care supervisors may now view the future from the perspective of history. Dorothy Parsons adds, "If women like Wisty Rorabacher continue to surface in the UW System, we'll continue to move toward quality child care wherever it is needed."

NOTES TO CHAPTER 14

1. *Milwaukee Sentinel*, July 21, 1970, section 1, p. 6

2. "UW System Child Care Services," a report prepared by Assistant Professor David Burke, UW-Madison, following the July, 1976, UW Campus Child Care Conference held at UW-Eau Claire. The report discusses in detail the issues of university participation in day care programs and reports: "In the case of the University of Wisconsin, given its powerful role as a people's university, it seems particularly appropriate to view university supported child care as yet another instance in the long history of the institution's exemplary service to the people." (Files, University of Wisconsin System, Office of Women, Madison.)

3. The UW-Green Bay child care statement includes the following: "The purpose of the center is to involve the parents of preschool children in a group effort to develop and maintain a children's center where meaningful and pleasant learning experiences take place in a healthy and stimulating environment and in a relaxed atmosphere of friendship and cooperation.

   It is our feeling that children grow best in an environment that allows them freedom to initiate their own activities. Such an environment should contain a minimum of adult intervention and control. Children will be free to circulate to areas of their own interest. At the same time we will maintain a favorable adult-child ratio to insure that children can have individual adult attention when they seek it. Such formal structure as is deemed appropriate by the teachers will be sufficiently flexible to take these ideas into account.

   For the Children: To expand the children's horizon by experience beyond the home and family. To give the children the opportunity to develop friendships among children of their own age, to foster social development. To be sensitive to the children's special needs and to relate to them as unique persons with individual styles of learning. To offer a wide variety of experience, recognizing the value of both structured activities and free play.

   For the Parents: To give parents the opportunity to share the responsibility of child care among other parents in the community. To encourage parents to get to know and care about children of other members of the cooperative. To free women to pursue activities outside the home. To encourage men to share the responsibility of child care. To create a program of parent education on preschool children. To develop and maintain a parents' library at the Center."

   In 1972 Aaronson moved to Madison where she has been deeply involved in the child care movement. She helped initiate the Memorial Union day care center on the UW-Madison campus, and served as president of the policy board of Child Development, Inc., a non-profit day care corporation managing eight centers in Madison.

4. Files UW System Office of Women.

5. "University of Wisconsin System Child Care Services." Figures should be considered tentative.

Campus	Licensed Capacity*	Actually Served
Eau Claire	33	80
Fox Valley	35	50
Green Bay	43	110
La Crosse	45	45
Madison	36	36
Milwaukee	130	300
Oshkosh	60	60
Parkside	25	80
Platteville	40	40
River Falls**	40	40
Stevens Point	25	75
Stout	34	34
Superior	40	40
Whitewater	78	78

*Licensed capacity refers to the number of children the center is authorized to serve at one time, according to the state. A center may serve this many children in one of many programs.

**The River Falls center is sponsored by Catholic Charities.

6. Ibid.

15. Continuing Education: A Personal View

by Kathryn F. Clarenbach

The Background

In 1977, and indeed by 1970, there was virtually not an institution of higher learning that admitted women which did not have some form of special accommodation on behalf of mature women. This was a change that had developed rapidly during the decade of the 1960s; continuing education for women both influenced and was in turn influenced by other components of the women's movement of the sixties in the United States. While adult education and extension services have for most of this century provided educational programs for the continuing learner, the concerted attention on campuses to the population of women beyond the traditional age of college students was a new phenomenon.

The University of Wisconsin turned its attention to the population in 1961. Inspired by reports of the Minnesota plan, the Sarah Lawrence program and Rutgers' retraining in math for women, the UW-Madison dean of women's office began its investigation of these new efforts and comparable local needs over the summer of 1961. Publications of the American Council on Education, the National Association of Deans and Women Counselors, and a federal manpower study *Womanpower* (1957) were in agreement in their assessment of the national need for educated brainpower, the social waste of under-utilized womanpower, and the realities of women's lives that made continuing education sensible, if not imperative.

The literature was beginning to focus on these facts: women were living longer, had fewer children, were through bearing children by the age of thirty with another forty years of reasonably healthy life, were better educated than previous generations. In short, women were available to participate more fully and were asking — not yet demanding — more opportunities to do so. Many women whose children were in school by 1960 had themselves been employed full-time during World War II, had typically left the labor force when the veterans returned, were experiencing economic pressures for a second family pay check, and were impatient to make fuller use of their talents and training. The fact that Sputnik had been launched and United States policy makers were fearful of staying behind in the space race contributed to the willingness of some officials to respond favorably to women's concerns.

It was against this background that the University of Wisconsin launched its program of continuing education for women. After a summer of discussion and reading, during which I met as a volunteer with Dean of Women Martha Peterson and her staff, the decision was reached to test the Madison community's interests and needs by mailing a survey questionnaire. The questions developed by Dean Peterson's staff were mailed to three lists of likely respondents: wives of UW-Madison faculty, wives of doctors and wives of lawyers. Today we would shudder to think in terms of "wives of"; in 1961 we neither shuddered nor had we yet developed other rosters of interested women.

Returns from that survey were immediate and overwhelming. The final question, included innocently enough, turned out to be a ringer: "Would you be willing to have a personal interview?" Over four hundred respondents answered "yes," and the office phone began to ring almost at once with requests to schedule an interview. With neither expectation nor plans nor staff to conduct such interviews, the dean's staff huddled, agreed instead to sponsor a conference, and bravely made an appointment with UW Vice President Fred Harvey Harrington to present the idea and request $500 to conduct the meeting. At the conclusion of that brief and successful session with Harrington, he turned to Dean Peterson with the casual comment, "Martha, I suppose you have someone on this full-time." Unabashed, she replied, "Of course." Thus are major academic decisions made.

As the only member of the delegation to Harrington who was not already on the dean's staff and as a primary instigator of this entire inquiry, I very much hoped to be invited to fill this new responsibility. Yet when the phone call came from Martha Peterson, I stalled and requested time to think it over. Our third and youngest child was in nursery school two hours each afternoon, the older two in the grades. I mused to my husband, "If this were next year when Janet will be in kindergarten half days, I wouldn't hesitate to say yes."

His immediate reply was, "This is not next year. The job is now and it's tailor-made for you. We'll make arrangements for Janet."

The supportiveness which has been a constant ever since, overcame or minimized my guilt feelings and I did of course accept the appointment. The hesitations and inner conflict I experienced were to be expressed almost routinely over the years ahead in the many women who came through my office to share their aspirations and plan some changes in their lives. My empathy with their feelings and my personal knowledge that coping was possible were valuable assets in that advisory process.

My first assignment was to plan the February, 1962, conference which Virginia Senders, co-founder of the Minnesota plan, keynoted. The conference planners as a matter of rather daring policy had decided Dr. Senders should not be expected to donate her services but should be properly compensated. We were proud to pay her $200.

Between that well-attended and thought-provoking conference and July 1, I was to develop a plan for University of Wisconsin-Madison in continuing education for women. Many people contributed ideas, time and patience in that process. Among the most helpful were Dr. E. B. Fred, president emeritus of the university who maintained an office in the basement of Bascom Hall; Ruth Doyle and Dr. Pat Tautfest of Martha Peterson's staff; and Opal David who headed the American Council on Education's commission on the education of women from 1958 to 1961. Dr. Esther Raushenbush, president of Sarah Lawrence College, conferred with us, at the same time serving on President Kennedy's commission on the status of women.

Before the five-month planning period had ended, UW President Conrad Elvejhem decided that an office for continuing education for women should be permanent; it was located in the dean of women's office, as we envisioned that the responsibilities would cover many aspects of women's lives which an academic office wouldn't touch. During this same time the University Extension Division employed Constance Fuller Threinen, and UW-Milwaukee and extension jointly hired Dorothy Miniace, to develop continuing education for women in their respective jurisdictions.

Unlike many of the programs developed elsewhere, the philosophy and intent at UW-Madison was not to establish a separate, isolated series of services and courses for the mature woman. We wanted no second-class, patronizing treatment, nor did we want to build a wasteful bureaucracy. Rather we sought to make the entire institution hospitable to all students, regardless of age, gender, or discontinuity in educational experience. We anticipated a day when any person could enroll in any course of studies, with the only limiting factor the ability to do the work, and we addressed ourselves to that end.

We also rejected the "life in stages" doctrine. That doctrine was put forth as a rationale for continuing education of mature women. The pattern of the traditional American woman's life was education, brief employment, marriage, child bearing, gradual return to education/occupation after the youngest child was in school full-time, increase of out-of-home activity as in-home responsibilities dwindled. While this description was accurate for the lives of many women, our rejection of it had several bases.

The notion implied acceptance of the status quo, had a limited middle-class orientation, continued the stereotypes of woman as economic dependent and primary parent, opened no new options, and relegated women to perpetual second-class achievers. The idea had broad support precisely because it was convenient and rocked no boats. We realized that "life in stages" fit many women, but we emphasized instead a range of lifestyles of which this was only one and we focused on choices at every step: to marry or not to marry, to bear children or not, to have a continuous professional/occupational life, to be in and out of school or job as desired, to be a homemaker, wage earner, volunteer simultaneously, in seriatim, or not at all. We hoped to prevent social waste and individual frustration throughout the life cycle.

Our task at the university became one of identifying the barriers, finding those people with authority to snip the red tape, explaining the need for new procedures or a different rationale, and gradually redirecting or expanding the scope of an entire range of university services. It was not easy to persuade faculty and administrative personnel that the women for whom we spoke were serious students and that this nascent movement was more than a passing fad. Some unmarried faculty women insisted that once a woman had chosen marriage, she had eschewed career and had no right to seek both. Some academic men were willing to admit mature women into their ranks provided the women realized their years out of the mainstream would relegate them permanently to secondary roles. Fortunately there was at least one sympathetic or enlightened person in most of the offices with which we dealt, and thus progress was possible.

Still, each small forward step represented sometimes several years of frustrating effort. We encouraged the women who came to our office to serve as pioneers as they wended their way through the academic maze, to report to us the stumbling blocks they met, and to try approaches and ask to deal by name with specific individuals we knew to be friendly. Gradually we began to see change.

The office of admissions became more willing to permit older women, including those whose earlier youthful academic records were not stellar, to enroll on probation and prove their current capabilities. Transfer of credits from other institutions became more acceptable, though overtones of elitism remained. Awarding course credit by testing, long permitted but rarely practiced, increased. Definitions of non-resident for purposes of university tuition were finally, after a most difficult struggle, applied equally to women and men and without reference to spouse. University student housing finally dropped its discriminatory practice of requiring a means test for married women. Age limits for professional schools, most of which wanted no one over thirty to enroll, were eliminated, at least on paper. (The director of the school of social work some years later called to me loudly and proudly across a crowded restaurant, "We've just admitted a black woman who is sixty years old.")

The requirement of most of the professional schools that entering students carry full-time loads was especially troublesome to women long out of school, with at-home and employment responsibilities. Except for the law school, which clung to its first-year full-time mandate, the others acknowledged this was no true test of either commitment or ability and dropped the requirement. The medical school invited Marian L. Thompson and me to help them explore the retention/dropout of women medical students. We met with twenty-eight women students in a candid discussion and learned of a number of practices that discouraged women. One that was promptly discontinued was a rule that no family member could accompany (and thus deflect) students during their several month resident-training in hospitals. A student who was nursing a two-month-old baby and whose husband was willing to care for the child between feedings, feared she might have to abandon her medical studies because of that rule. The deans agreed to the change.

Both the student counseling center and the office of financial aids came to realize that the adult student had some unique needs and circumstances. Both offices assigned appropriately qualified staff to serve this growing clientele.

Efforts to establish child care facilities on the UW-Madison campus were more completely frustrated than nearly any other project. On three occasions, beginning in 1963, we thought a facility was ready to open: a site was found, teachers lined up, fee arranged, state licensing approved, and clients ready. Yet each time the essential supplemental funding fell through. We did at least influence the planning of an addition to Eagle Heights to incorporate a multipurpose community center. Even in 1977, however, child care arrangements for students, faculty and staff in Madison and throughout the university system are most inadequate.

A more successful effort, and one not envisioned in our preliminary planning, was the job placement function. This began when university faculty members phoned to inquire whether we had encountered women interested in or qualified for filling various departmental administrative positions. Very soon by word of mouth the availability of this service became known to women seeking employment and to public and private employers. We helped women analyze their strengths and interests, describe their pertinent experience (paid and unpaid), package their expertise, and brush up on job-application techniques. We were able to persuade employers of the utility of flexible hours and less than full-time appointments, and employers learned for themselves the merits of hiring mature women. About ninety percent of our clients had employment as an utlimate goal with continuing education as a way station, if necessary, to update or redirect their previous schooling in order to become employable.

E. B. Fred Fellowship — 1963-68

A major significant component of the early continuing education for women on the UW-Madison campus was the E. B. Fred fellowship program, funded by the Carnegie Corporation of New York. This was a program designed to enable women beyond the traditional student age, who had had discontinuity in their educational/professional lives, to seek a Ph.D. or equivalent terminal degree, and to do so under flexible conditions. Initially a three-year experiment, that time was extended two more years to permit progress to be observed and a full report written.

In late fall of 1962, Ruth B. Doyle and I accompanied other members of the dean of women's staff to Chicago to attend the national meeting of the National Association of Deans and Women Counselors. Ruth and I, both of whom had been employed in the office experimentally as "married women with families" and on less than full-time schedules, were to report on the Wisconsin continuing education plans. In the audience was Florence Anderson, secretary of the Carnegie Corporation, who liked what she heard and after the session asked Martha Peterson how Carnegie could help.

Back in Madison, we thought long and hard about Florence Anderson's offer and concluded the most pressing need at Wisconsin was to demonstrate that mature women were academically competent and serious about their education, and, if given financial support and flexibility in scheduling, they could successfully cope with graduate studies. We needed to prove that part-time study did not mean a lesser commitment and should not disqualify one for financial aid, and that years away from the classroom did not necessarily atrophy the brain.

So we informed Carnegie that a graduate fellowship program was our number one need, only to be told that Carnegie was no longer in the fellowship business. We persisted, however, and presented our case to Carnegie a second time. In February, 1963, we were awarded $90,000 for three years, all of which would be used for outright grants to women, with administrative costs borne entirely by the university. An additional $60,000 was added later for another two years, in part to fund the final survey, evaluation and report.

An excellent committee was assembled, ground rules worked out, application form designed, and the program was publicized in time for April applications. We persuaded Dr. E. B. Fred to permit us to name the fellowship in his honor. Despite the short notice, 141 applications were received, thus confirming our assessment of interest and need.

During the five-year Carnegie-funded program, fifty-two women were awarded grants of up to $2,000 per year, which forty-nine accepted. As stated in the 1970 report, "staff and committee members have frequently said because of the number of fellows who have earned degrees and the relatively small amount of money received by each fellow, dollar for dollar the academic yield of this fellowship was the highest of any fellowship or scholarship at the University of Wisconsin."

The UW Graduate School, originally skeptical of the entire plan, became so persuaded that it has continued the program with its own far less substantial funds. In keeping with non-discrimination policies, the program has been opened to men, though both applicants and recipients remain predominantly women. Regrettably the size of awards has not kept pace with other graduate fellowships and thus are no longer truly serving the original purpose.

Today's Woman in Tomorrow's World

The first non-credit class expressly addressed to the new clientele was organized for the summer of 1963 at the suggestion of Mary Farrell of UW-Madison extension. A four-session class, it was designed primarily to respond simultaneously to the inquiries and hesitations of a group of women together, rather than to individuals on a one-to-one basis. The course responded to questions regarding university admissions and procedures, provided optional tours of campus facilities, administered a written exercise to establish confidence in writing skills, informed about the services of other community educational institutions, and allowed women to meet others in similar circumstances and be reassured they were neither freaks nor alone in their situation. Over one-hundred women enrolled the first year, many of whom continue to credit that experience as a significant turning point in their lives. This course served as a model that was adapted by Constance Threinen. Under the title "Explorations," it was offered through the Extension Division by Jane Le Dain in Fox Valley, Ione Brown in Green Bay and Kathleen Capwell in Racine-Kenosha. These faculty women, as well as Dorothy Miniace in Milwaukee, offered introductory courses and since have added other valuable activities and courses.

One of the unique and highly valuable aspects of the university's contributions to the education of mature women has been the intimate ties with the governor's commission on the status of women. The commission developed from President Kennedy's national commission on the status of women, the first such national body anywhere in the world to evaluate the circumstances of women's lives and make recommendations for change.

When Governor Reynolds invited me to chair the Wisconsin commission, which was to function for ten years before it had a budget of its own, I spoke with President Harrington. The assignment would take time, office support and some direct expense. Harrington's response was that this contribution from the university was precisely in keeping with the Wisconsin Idea, and he was glad to have leadership and direction of the commission based in the university. In 1966 the commission on the status of women held conferences on the campuses of the Wisconsin state colleges. On each agenda the subject of continuing education served as a rallying point to the respective campus to move ahead.

The university's cooperation that enabled the commission to function was equally supportive of the National Organization for Women (NOW) and the Interstate Association of Commissions on the Status of Women (now the National Association of Commissions for Women).

1967 — Extension Merger

In 1967 the University of Wisconsin became one of the first land-grant institutions to merge its U.S. Department of Agriculture-funded Cooperative

Extension with its General Extension Division. At the same time a special UW *ad hoc* committee studied and recommended the move of a number of academic units and other programs from the UW-Madison campus into the newly merged University Extension. One of the units moved was university education for women. The reason offered was that because this office had statewide responsibility or influence — as President Harrington had repeatedly requested — it served an extension function and its budget should not be borne by a single campus. An unspoken reason strongly suspected by many, however, was that decision-makers on the UW-Madison campus did not regard the education of mature women of sufficient importance to warrant their support.

It was nearly another year before the extension administrators finally implemented the decision that Marian Thompson and I would be combined with Constance Threinen and her extension continuing education for women, and determined that all three of us would be further incorporated with the cooperative extension's home economists. This put all faculty women who were concerned predominately with women's education together. In part it was an early effort to make available to the cooperative extension some of the resources of general extension, and in turn to open the well developed county and community channels of cooperative extension to other disciplines. Women's and family living education was agreed upon as the best compromise designation for this wide-ranging group of women's interests.

One forum for collaboration of the combined departments was college week for women, a summer program for Wisconsin women that extension home economists had then sponsored for about five years. The inclusion of the three women's education specialists (Threinen, Thompson, and Clarenbach) on the college week committee had a broadening effect on the scope and quality of that program. Now in the fourteenth year of college week, that collaboration continues to our mutual benefit, and the program is a national model.

In the new setting of extension and with the ferment of the women's movement everywhere, the thrust of women's continuing education took on new directions. We were engaged in giving statewide leadership to organizations, working within extension to sensitize and motivate such departments as law, school for workers, journalism, and business to program on behalf of women, collaborating where possible with campuses, and working with other state agencies which have the potential for affecting the lives of women. It was impossible to do all those things and still confer with and advise individual women, so that latter function which had previously been a major activity gradually was phased out. It became necessary to recognize that there was no longer any "one stop" service geared to meet women's complex needs.

By 1972, under a new internal organization of extension, women's education resources was separated from family living and the focus of our small office could be more clearly and explicitly defined.

> Women's education resources addresses its program both to individual women and their self-expectations and to the institutions which shape and reflect our values. Its concerns include equal legal treatment, recognition and development of individual potential by eliminating sex-stereotypes at all education levels, improved economic status through real affirmative action in all aspects of public and private employment,

> comprehensive health information and care, and significant expansion of supportive and enabling facilities and services (child care, household help, family planning) essential to a realistic widening of women's choices.
>
> This program is statewide in scope, relying on appropriate academic resources on every campus in the University of Wisconsin System and on the expertise and authority of many public agencies.

To fulfill that mission it has been our contention since 1970 that our primary attention should be directed toward those women in Wisconsin whose educational needs were most acute and whose opportunities were most limited. Many continuing education programs across the nation continue to serve primarily the college-oriented woman, who is usually white, middle class, and has some previous higher education. We believe the needs of that population can be met in Wisconsin by traditional institutions where procedures are already underway to accommodate them.

We have also acknowledged that it is essential to proceed on the multiplier principle, working through organizations, training the trainers, responding to and relying on the many individuals who are increasingly mindful of their stake in the social changes now in process. For example, we cooperate with women's studies and other faculty on all UW campuses and throughout University Extension. We conduct statewide educational telephone network non-credit classes; some fifteen to twenty non-credit courses are held each semester. Our office conducted the first course in the state on "Women and the Law," in cooperation with Professor Robert Seidman of the UW law school. We assisted in convening the UW Association of Faculty Women in Madison in 1970, and a year later on a system-wide basis. The Wisconsin Women's Political Caucus had similar help from our office; Wisconsin Tribal Women, Inc., an organization of women of the eleven tribes in our state, has the ongoing encouragement and educational help of our office. In 1970 we inaugurated a three-year federally-funded project on "Women in Apprenticeship" and subsequently conducted an evaluation of the *Federal Dictionary of Occupational Titles*. In 1973, extension arts and women's education resources co-sponsored with the Johnson Foundation at Wingspread a national conference on "Women in the Arts."

Our realization of the need to eradicate sex-role stereotyping from all levels of education has involved us in several task forces and committees. A 1974 series of six conferences in the state, sponsored by the governor's commission on the status of women on the subject of "Homemaking and the Family: Changing Values and Concerns," was co-sponsored by the five university campuses and Alverno College which hosted the meetings. Repercussions of those educational experiences continue into 1977 with growing interest on the part of homemakers, educators and legislators in understanding the legal and economic status of the homemaker and in working toward those changes indicated in law and social policy. In 1976 we began to investigate and make recommendations on the educational needs of rural women and girls. In 1976-77, our office has worked closely with the national commission on the observance of international women's year, and currently I am executive director of the 1977 national women's conference.

Lifelong learning for men as well as women is a continuing and indeed an increasing need. The passage of Public Law 94-482 in October of 1976, known as the Mondale lifelong learning bill, is evidence that the federal government is now aware of this ongoing need. Educational institutions have been slow to move in the many ways that are essential to meet the challenge. It is the fifteen year experience of continuing education for women that has effectively charted paths that could well be followed all over the world.

As the University of Wisconsin moves forward in its programs and services for the mature woman, much will remain constant and much will change. Counseling, referral, placement, job opportunities, financial assistance, child care, health maintenance, are among the ever-present needs. Course content and emphases will change rapidly as women's studies unearth and develop the contributions of women to our society, as women gain their rightful place in scholarly and public life, and as the community in general comes to respect and value the rights and responsibilities of women.

16. An E. B. Fred Fellow

by Fannie Hicklin

Would I be eligible? This was the question foremost in my mind as I ascended to the bank building office of a person whom I soon learned to admire: Dr. Kathryn Clarenbach. My only luxury as a very poor graduate student, divorced and the mother of a fifteen-year-old high school junior, was a subscription to a daily newspaper. In it, one day I noted an article regarding a new fellowship program to be instituted at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. I badly needed financial assistance. Despite my being a teaching assistant in the department of speech and my typing for the director of the Wisconsin center for theatre research, I could not make ends meet. Though my day was already full (I arose at 6 a.m., attended classes or worked until 8 p.m., and then studied until midnight or later), I had applied for a weekend and holiday job as receptionist at Madison General Hospital. But it was obvious that the interviewer had no interest in a black person, no matter how qualified. I had even humbled myself to seek Aid for Dependent Children, but was informed that I did not qualify because I was not permanently in need.

Such was my economic status when I read the newspaper article. I had a glimmer of hope — but very slight. For I remembered that when I graduated from college and when I received my master's degree, I had applied for fellowships, but in the competition with older, more experienced persons — chiefly male — I had received only letters of consolation, "I'm sorry that. . . ." And in more recent years I had not even applied because the qualifications were such as "graduating senior," "person with no previous graduate school experience," "person under forty years of age." However, here in the newspaper was an announcement of a fellowship that stated none of those restrictions. And so I was encouraged, but cautiously so.

I was probably the first person to inquire about the program. I was told that the funds had been awarded but that no details of administration had even been considered at that time. Having supplied my name and address so that I might be contacted when implementation plans were established, I descended to University Avenue and Park Street more subdued than I had been fifteen or twenty minutes earlier.

As I waited for news, the need for a major operation suddenly arose. "What more?" I thought. "Why me?" Before entering the hospital, I returned to Dr. Clarenbach's office for a progress report. I was assured that discussions were ensuing but that no announcement regarding application would be forthcoming during my hospital residence.

I don't remember the date of the application announcement; I only know that I made an application and that I was amazed that for once the qualifications seemed those which I could meet satisfactorily. Once the application was made, I was too busy with prelims, elective courses, dissertation, and my jobs to ponder the possible outcome of my application.

Joy! The postman delivered the delightful news that I was the recipient of a very handsome E. B. Fred Fellowship for 1963-64. The expectation of the committee was that this sum would eliminate my need to work. But I needed no accountant to indicate the impossibility of stretching the sum to cover my needs and those of my daughter; so, quite suddenly the bubble of delight burst. Sadly I climbed Bascom Hill and conferred with Professor Ordean Ness whose office door was always open to students with problems; I requested reinstatement as a teaching assistant so that I might reject the fellowship. Resourceful man, he asked whether I had notified the committee regarding my circumstances. Upon my saying that I had not, he strongly suggested that I should go down the hall to the office of Professor Edward Mulvihill, the chair of the E. B. Fred fellowship committee. In awe, I went before Professor Mulvihill and presented my case. He questioned me carefully, proposed possible amendments to my financial package and dismissed me with the encouraging words that he would poll the members of the committee. A few hours later, Dr. Clarenbach called with the news that the new package had been unanimously approved by the committee; the major amendment was that I would be allowed to teach one course. I could have the award distinction and a satisfactory income simultaneously. This stroke of good fortune quickly scattered the remnants of my anxiety, generating at this time from the after effects of major surgery and from the intense pressure of preparing for prelims. My thought was "I'm really on my way." And so I became one of the first E. B. Fred fellows.

Being a fellow was not merely a means of financial assistance. It was an honor. It was an opportunity to discover the commitment of Dr. Clarenbach and others to encourage women to pursue advanced study. It was recognition of the need for flexible fellowships for women whose needs differed from the graduate student fresh from undergraduate school. During brown-bag luncheons and informal receptions, E. B. Fred fellows became acquainted with each other, with the programs each woman was pursuing, and could establish collegiality.

My first thoughts of graduate study must have been born with me; I cannot remember ever being without them. However, many were the years and the hurdles between my birth and the attainment of my Ph.D. in January of 1965 as the first graduate in the E. B. Fred fellowship program. The fellowship speeded me on my way, but also of significant help were the people I met, such as Professors Frederick Haberman and Ordean Ness who wrote recommendations and members of the committee who provided me with inspiration at a major point in my career.

Whereas the fellowship and I met when I was already in pursuit of the doctorate, for many women the fellowship was the beginning of studies that could never have been considered or that would have been long delayed. The committee to allocate the funds wrought well when they provided flexible and innovative procedures for reaching and encouraging women.

17. Continuing Education Services in the UW System

by Peg Geisler

In many ways, Professor Kay Clarenbach has personified the history of continuing education for women, not only within the University of Wisconsin, but across the nation. The leadership she has displayed in initiating programs, services, and political action to benefit the fullest human development of women is a proud part of the tradition of Wisconsin.

Her story relates the efforts carried forth in the programs with which she has been associated since 1961. In referring to the many activities of women's education resources, Clarenbach has stated, "It was impossible to do all those things and still confer with and advise individual women, so that latter function which had previously been a major activity gradually had to be phased out." One reason services to individual women could be phased out in the extension office was that programs to fill this need had been developed on various campuses of the university and were to be developed on others and, indeed, in other offices of the extension division.

Of special concern were the women approaching the university in order to return to formal education. In addition to those who sought non-credit programming, many women wished credit courses, sequences of courses, or degree programs on the undergraduate, graduate, or professional levels.

Integral to the demand for continuing education programming was a counseling component. As Jean Campbell of the University of Michigan noted in an address to the American Council on Education in 1974, "Knowledgeable counseling is perhaps the single most important service to nontraditional students."[1] Sometimes seen as a separate and identifiable function, frequently intertwined with non-credit programming, adult counseling services were called for by returning women. A 1972 survey indicated that the more than thirteen hundred women students age twenty-eight and over at UW-Madison were not using the existing counseling services on campus and that they did want an office designed for returning adults.[2] Educational, vocational, financial, and personal counseling were requested. Problems of time pressures, self-confidence, role definition, and a sense of direction were most common. Child care, financial assistance, and class schedules appropriate to their life commitments were matters of concern. These women did not have access to public school counselors as did their children. They did not always feel comfortable with counseling services geared to the younger students. They wanted assistance from professionals attuned to the needs, the experiences, and the developmental stages of mature adult life. They wanted counselors prepared to discuss with them the broadest range of educational and vocational options without regard for the traditional boundaries of sex stereotyping in career choice.

Who were the returning women and what were their needs? An overview indicates several groups: (1) women whose youngest children were just entering school, who faced the "empty nest" and determined to make new plans for their future; (2) women who had made significant contributions to their communities through civic voluntarism and who wished to combine that experience with further formal education in order to work professionally; (3) women who had marriages terminated by divorce and who, perhaps for the first time, needed skills for economic survival and professional development; (4) older women recently widowed who sought new life involvements and commitments; (5) professionally employed women who found themselves dead-ended without further education (including, in large numbers, clerical workers who, as a result of the women's movement, saw openings in administration and management for which academic credentials were required); (6) professional women who wished to hone their skills and advance in their professions; (7) professional women in emotionally demanding fields who found themselves "burned out" by their jobs and looking for new directions. Conversely, women in technical, sales, or administrative areas sought fields with more of a service orientation; (8) unemployed and underemployed women; (9) creative homemakers and professional women who wanted both credit and non-credit programming which would allow them to maintain or develop areas of personal interest; (10) women with a deep intellectual curiosity and desire to grow; lifelong learners taking themselves seriously as responsible human beings.

During the years from the mid-sixties to the mid-seventies several programs developed within the University of Wisconsin. At UW-Green Bay, UW-Madison, UW-Milwaukee, and within the student services office of extension, programs were developed for adults engaged in lifelong education which typified the response on the diverse campuses of the university. Striking similarities can be seen in the four programs. All offered services to adults as individuals and in groups, in on- and off-campus settings. At the same time, a particular focus developed in one program was able to be amended or adapted for another location. This essay will highlight particular emphases typifying the activities within the university system. It does not pretend to cover all of the developing programs for women at the university, but to use these four programs as examples.

In 1963, UW-Milwaukee and UW-Extension established an office of continuing education for women on the UW-Milwaukee campus, under the direction of Dorothy Miniace who held a joint appointment in those two branches of the university. In 1967, as more returning men requested similar services, the appellation "for women" was dropped and the office designated for both men and women, became the office of continuing education for adults. This history was typical of the programs on other campuses: the initial impetus was for services for women, followed by a shift to services for all adults in which women continued to be the majority of the clientele.

The Milwaukee continuing education office was from its inception involved both in non-credit programming and in counseling. The staff made a very real effort to reach women in the Milwaukee area by developing on- and off-campus seminars on life-planning and other topics, by serving as speakers for civic organizations, and by serving as members of community organizations and boards. Thus, the continuing educational role of the existing social and civic organizations in this large, urban community was reinforced as Dorothy Miniace encouraged the lifelong learning possibilities inherent in them.

Counseling services were provided for women at the campus office. In addition, an outreach counseling service was established in the Milwaukee public libraries by Lorna Nance of the continuing education staff. Every home within a twelve block area of a library was notified of the service and many women took advantage of it. Outreach services to the urban and suburban communities reflected the mission of UW-Milwaukee. The office initiated a consortium of continuing education staff from other institutions of post-secondary education in the city, and in 1977 became involved in the development of in-service training programs for staff members in social service agencies working with the economically and educationally disadvantaged citizens of Milwaukee. Over the years many workshops and conferences were sponsored which provided leadership and support to women who were considering or were involved in a return to education.

At UW-Green Bay, Marge Engelman, currently director of outreach, began her work in 1967 as an assistant for returning adults, offering counseling to individuals returning to the campus. "Seminar for Women: Exploring Your Future" provided an opportunity in a group setting for women to investigate the impact of various educational and vocational choices on their lives. The seminar was conducted on the campus, in the community, and at the Fox Valley Center which was at that time an adjunct campus to UW-Green Bay. Marian Stern of the outreach staff had groups in Sturgeon Bay, serving the Door County peninsula. This type of seminar was given by each of the continuing education offices. On each campus and in outreach programs in the communities throughout the state, such workshops involved hundreds of women in reassessment, evaluation, and the learning of implementation skills for life planning. These workshops provided encouragement and support for women involved in the life planning process. Simply stated, the goal in both individual and group sessions was to start with the individual in assessing values, interests, skills, and life commitments in order to focus upon a chosen career direction. This was then related to the realities of the educational and professional world, so that women could make constructive plans.

UW-Green Bay was especially active in working with mothers of young children. Marian Stern and Mary Rollin coordinated a program entitled "Young Mothers Back to School," offering that group information and support services as they considered a return to formal education. The adult education office, as it was then known, was very much involved in the establishment of a cooperative day-care center on the campus.

Another area of special concern was financial assistance for the part-time students. Because state and federal guidelines limited financial aid to the student taking six or more credits, and because many adults could take only one course at a time, the staff spent many hours talking with community organizations, encouraging scholarship support for returning students. The money that was raised was used frequently as an indication of encouragement for women as well as for financial support. The concern for appropriate financial assistance for the part-time adult student was apparent in every continuing education program. It led to fund raising activities and to efforts to effect change in state and federal guidelines.

Non-credit and credit offerings of the university were scheduled through the office of outreach at times convenient for adult learners. In this setting, both programming and counseling were combined. The staff worked cooperatively with UW-Extension staff to bring programs and services to Green Bay and the surrounding communities.

The Milwaukee and Green Bay programs were continuous from the mid-sixties. At Madison, a void existed in counseling for adults after 1967 when continuing education for women moved to extension. In 1972, the office of continuing education services (CES), with Joy Rice, director, opened its doors as an educational and vocational counseling service for returning adult students in response to the need for such services voiced by older women students and by women in the community. The Association of Faculty Women also encouraged such an office. An early supporter and advocate was Cyrena Pondrom, then director of affirmative action. Typically, women called for the service, but when implemented, CES increased access to education for both men and women.

This author was involved in the program from the beginning, with special interest in relating individual counseling needs to the resources of the campus and advocating campus policies relevant to the returning student. Douglas Ray, Diana Mrotek, Georgiana March, Mary Wagener, Judith Hooper and Carla Heimerl over the years developed an extensive variety of group workshops for the adults facing career decisions, as well as providing individual counseling services.

Originally housed in the student counseling center, CES later became a part of continuing education programs, the office which administered the development of extended-day and outreach programming for the campus. Special sensitivity to the needs of returning women was always of concern. The staff believed firmly that the mature students were capable, motivated individuals who enriched the campus and could, with support and encouragement, accomplish their goals. Study skills programs were conducted. Workshops on such topics as "Single Parent Students" and "Assertiveness Training" came at the specific request of the women. The office pioneered in the use of paraprofessionals — women who were returning students themselves, or involved in their own professional development, assisted other women in the reentry process. Supervision and training were provided for these paraprofessionals, many of whom went on to professional positions in the field of continuing education. Frequently, academic credit for this experience was arranged as part of the field work, practicum, or intern programs of various departments.

Of particular concern to this office was the development of reliable referral sources within the campus. Women needed specific up-to-date information on the educational opportunities which existed, and needed assistance in reaching the appropriate source for academic, financial, and career advising. A grapevine of campus faculty and staff who demonstrated positive response to adult returnees was developed so that referrals were to individuals not to offices, titles, or telephone numbers. Women frequently lacked mobility as they faced career decisions and needed reliable information on employment possibilities within or near Madison. CES staff made a deliberate attempt to work with campus placement officers and local employers to develop an understanding of local employment opportunities. In addition, a leadership role was taken in encouraging the development of alternative employment models. The traditional five-day/forty-hour week not only was not sacred, it did not meet the needs of many women and men. Legislative action to provide options such as shared appointments, flexible time scheduling, and a four-day/forty-hour week was supported. Assemblywoman Midge Miller took both a state and national leadership role in developing legislation. CES staff members served as consultants in these efforts.

While attention to the needs of individual adults was the prime focus of the staff, we served also as advocates for this population on campus, attempting to effect change in university policy so that the needs of an adult student population were reflected. As in the mid-60s, the attempt was to have the returning students accepted as an integral part of the student body with campus-wide policies which responded to the heterogeneity of age, experience, and interest. Admissions criteria, orientation procedures and literature, and course scheduling were all matters of concern. The relevance of a dated grade point average as a predictor of academic success for a student out of school for years was questioned. In 1976, research was initiated to obtain data on the academic performance of reentry students both before and after the interruption in education. Preliminary results showed a significant increase in grade point average upon return. Low correlation of previous grade point average to reentry grade point average suggested that the earlier grades were not the best predictors of reentry academic performance.[1]

In 1973, the CES office was funded by Title I of the Higher Education Act to survey counselors of returning adults in the state to determine just what services were available. Diana Mrotek organized that spring a statewide conference for increasing avenues of communication among those who were counseling adults in higher education. The conference was attended by counselors from almost every public and private post-secondary institution in the state, and became the basis for congenial and cooperative planning and programming throughout Wisconsin. In subsequent years, Title I funds allowed the development of a series of life-planning workshops which were given in Madison and throughout the state. These funds were a part of the same project funded for UW-Extension's community based educational counseling for adults (CBECA) program, and allowed for cooperative programming which served many adults in all parts of Wisconsin. At Connie Threinen's request, CES staff developed a workshop called "Decision Making for Career Planning" which has been given year after year at college week for women.

Recognizing that an on-campus appointment for educational counseling was impossible, inconvenient, or intimidating for many adults, UW-Extension's office of student services, directed by David Jensen, proposed a pilot project to determine the need for an off-campus educational counseling service. Carmen Thompson coordinated the program as it developed. The project was initiated in Racine, Kenosha, Walworth, and Waukesha counties in the southeast corner of Wisconsin. The purpose of the service was to provide information on all the educational resources of the state, not just those of the university system. Thus, an adult could learn about opportunities in the vocational-technical system, and the private colleges as well as those of the university. The overwhelming response to the pilot project proved the need for such a service. With succeeding years, as funds became available through Title I, CBECA was extended to various areas of the state, with the goal of eventually covering the entire state. By 1977, community based counselors offered services in thirty-two of the seventy-two Wisconsin counties.

Individuals who lived in and were acquainted with local communities were employed and trained as counselors. These counselors provided services on a regular basis in existing community facilities such as libraries, banks, and courthouses. With regular schedules posted, adults could stop in to learn about the educational opportunities available to them. (For example, Mary Wagener lived in Brooklyn, Wisconsin, and served the communities of Mt. Horeb, Stoughton, Oregon, Middleton, Monroe, New Glarus, and Brodhead.) Among special populations reached by the community based counselors were ethnic minorities, the incarcerated, and those adults needing to complete their secondary education. An emphasis was placed on follow-up contacts, in the realization that non-traditional students might be apprehensive about a return to education and need some extra support.

Among the tasks of the community based counselors was the development of a resource network on each campus. Frequently, continuing education offices were the point of contact. It was not unusual for the community based counselor to accompany the prospective student or make telephone contact for him or her on the campus.

With their emphasis upon individual counseling, community based counselors called upon staff of UW-Madison's office of continuing education services to provide group workshops for their clientele. As an example, Carla Heimerl of CES in Madison and Joyce LaPorte of CBECA in Rhinelander frequently cooperated in the development and presentation of workshops. One of the advantages of group workshops was the mutual support which returning adults drew from each other as they contemplated educational and vocational decision-making. With the community based counselors providing the participants and the local resource information, CES staff brought workshops which centered upon values clarification, decision-making skills, job search skills, and life-planning models. Again, special awareness of the needs of adult women was central to workshop development and implementation.

This summary only begins to touch upon the response of the university to the needs of adult women. The fact that each of the services was used extensively indicates the degree to which the response was appropriate to the need. The women seen at each of the counseling sites truly became a part of the history of the University of Wisconsin System. As returning students they brought to the campuses enthusiasm, determination, and a wealth of life experience which greatly enriched the classroom and enhanced the educational experience of students of all ages. Lifelong learning is here to stay. The adult women of the state have made it clear they intend to take advantage of all of the educational opportunities available to them. The history of continuing education for women is but a prelude to ever-increasing demand in the future.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 17

1 Jean Campbell "The Non-Traditional Student," *Women in Higher Education*, Eds. W. Furniss and P. Graham, American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., 1972, p. 196.

2 M. Geisler and R. Thrush, "Counseling Experiences and Needs of Older Women Students," *Journal of National Association of Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors*, 39, 1 1975, pp. 3-8.

3 Annette Kelly, "A Comparison Study of Grade Point Averages in Traditional and Non-Traditional Students," UW Madison, 1976.

Kelly, A., Geisler, M. and Wilcox, L. "The Academic Performance of Returning Adult Students," *College Board Review*, 106, 1978, p. 13-16.

18. Meeting the Needs of Re-entering Students

Developing a Course at Stevens Point

by Isabelle Stelmahoske

Three years ago, the English department at the University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point began providing, for students away from school for two or more years, an optional special section of the required freshman English course. The history of the formation of the special section provides a useful footnote to the struggle against sexism, and the responses of the women enrolled provide an illuminating insight into their needs and concerns as persons earlier shunted out of the educational stream.

The special section grew out of my awareness over a period of several years of the two or three older students regularly enrolled in each of my freshman English classes. The three older students in each section typically included a male veteran in his late twenties, a woman also that age, and another woman of forty or fifty. My concern for them developed from observation of their relationship to the twenty-one seventeen and eighteen-year-olds. In the past I had noticed that the younger students listened raptly if one of the distinctive three was uninhibited enough to share his/her experiences. But there *was* inhibition, both on the part of the younger students and on the part of these three.

Several of these older students had intimated to me that they felt their desire for an education now had placed them somehow beyond the comfortable normalcy of their peers — most of whom were obviously not in sight. But I knew, if these three didn't, there were at least 140 older students in freshman classes alone. I thought about the unrealized possibility of these older students: the possibility of the full realization of the grace that maturity brings to the task; a possibility now withheld, tentative, as they seemed to observe rather than participate in the class.

In the spring of 1973, I decided that they might be better served by the opportunity to be with others like themselves who were now dispersed throughout the approximately seventy sections of freshman English. Why not give older students an opportunity to be together? Not permanently, not on a second track in English I decided, but just once, for one semester, so that they could reach out for information and camaraderie during the rest of the two, three, or four years.

I talked with the older students I knew and with some of my colleagues who had voiced concerns like mine for those we came to speak of as non-traditional students. (During that first special section of "Freshman English for the Non-traditional Student," when we studied euphemisms, the telephone lineman in class volunteered — to an appreciative roar — that non-traditional was a euphemism for "old"). I proposed that the English department designate one section of freshman English for the non-traditional student, whom we defined as "anyone who has been away from academic work for two or more years." Despite strong support for the section in the department, there were challenges to the idea, ranging from the sexist, "And what will you do with this old-ladies' society once you've formed it?" and the sadistic, "But I *want* them to feel insecure. I want to shake them up!" to an objective consideration of whether the separate section would create community or isolation. Since there would be no requirement that anyone take the section — it would simply be there in the timetable — we felt that only those in need would enroll in the class.

In order to assure the availability of the class, we decided to schedule it for a single two and a half hour evening session. We felt that the maturity of these students would enable them to organize their study and to sustain attention. About one-third of the readings were especially chosen for older adults and I made wide use of campus lectures, plays and films for shared experiences we might use for writing. I felt that many adults returned to formal education to re-enter the world of art and intellect from which they had come to feel estranged.

The first offering of the class was oversubscribed by seven for a total of thirty-two. It was taught the next semester on Saturday mornings with twenty-three students, and during the next two years during the first semester in the evening, both times to enrollments closed at twenty-eight. More students sought to enter both times. A total of one hundred eleven enrolled in the course in the last three years: sixty-one women and fifty-one men — facts chastening to the colleague who prematurely deplored an all-female enrollment. Obviously, not all the non-traditional students on campus felt the need of the special section but those who did (with only one exception) are emphatic about the value it had for them. In the course evaluations sought immediately after the students had completed the work, I found no distinguishable variation between men and women in enthusiasm for the special section.

Now, three years later, I sought to discover something about the validity of my concern for the non-traditional students, especially the women, and their need for a special section. And though the re-entry of women is the subject of examination in this essay, the special section served men who had delayed university entrance as well. Five-elevenths of the enrollees have been men: veterans, barbers, electricians, insurance company employees, crop-duster pilots, nursing trainees, and television cameramen.

A further caveat is necessary for the reader about my sources and the generalizations that follow. Immediately after each semester's offering of the special section, all members of that class were asked to evaluate the course using a standardized form. In addition, I invited a statement of opinion in essay form. Finally, just prior to this writing I sent a survey questionnaire to forty-eight of the women enrolled during the four semesters. Of the forty-eight sent, three were returned as undeliverable and twenty-six responses were received. My generalizations are drawn from my conversations with students, from the end of semester evaluations, and from this survey. It should be remembered that responses to the survey were written years or months after the women had taken the course.[1]

Of the total number of women enrolled in the section, those who had been away from academic work from ten to thirty-two years exactly equalled those who returned nine or fewer years after high school. One woman in each group identified herself as a high school dropout. The woman who had been out of school more than ten years was a mother of eight children and grandmother of six, and had completed only one year of high school. She entered the university after successfully passing the General Educational Development Test and upon receiving federal and state grants for vocational rehabilitation. She said she entered "to satisfy intellectual curiosity" and, if possible, "to earn a degree" to qualify her for "work in sociology or psychology." She was enrolled for one semester before the course was offered and had not taken freshman English. Of that time, she said, "My most apparent social problem was the lack of someone my age to relate to. I was the only little old lady in a class of people less than half my age. My most apparent academic problem was my lack of education in how to express myself in writing." Another student made her aware of the special section and she enrolled. Speaking about that special section now, from the perspective of a month after graduation, with a major in sociology and a minor in psychology, she says,

> I had felt out of place in classes before. I felt that everyone my age already knew all of the things I didn't know and was just beginning to learn. It was reassuring to know there were other older students who felt the same as I did. I felt the course was rewarding for me because the materials seemed to be planned to be interesting to mature students who brought the experience necessary for their appreciation.

(The fact that every sociology and psychology paper she wrote thereafter was graded *A* confirmed for her that the special section was not an indulgence.)

The other high school dropout was returning as a special student after only a five-year lapse. The availability of the course on Saturday mornings was her primary reason for enrolling in this section (since she had a child to support and a full-time job); she felt no specific motivational or social concerns. Yet she said, "I thoroughly enjoyed the class, especially the writing." (She not only enjoyed it, she excelled at it, distinguishing herself as the best writer of some 1,800 who have submitted their efforts to me in my twelve years of university teaching.) Though she is not in attendance now because as she says, "I got married and couldn't afford schooling anymore," she has the ultimate goal of a degree in sociology.

All but one in the ten to thirty-two group were married and had children. Most of the students in this group list "money" and "time" as the special problems attendant on their return to school. Coordinating schedules with what they deemed to be their home and family responsibilities seemed most difficult. Three said they had no special problems and three felt "self-conscious" and verbally inadequate ("my vocabulary wouldn't be good enough").

Reasons for returning to school were almost equally distributed four ways in this older group. An encouraging husband and/or family were cited most often. Next was the realization that without degrees their achievement of work goals would be limited. Finally, an equal number cited the encouragement of faculty who were personal friends, and the compelling power of curiosity and interest.

Two-thirds of these women identified specific degree-requiring career goals, goals most often discovered in their present employment: library work, work with the mentally retarded, early childhood education, social work, and nursing. Personal enrichment was the primary value of the other third, half of whom worked full-time. One cited intense job dissatisfaction and the desire for an opportunity to discover her talents.

The existence of the special section played a significant part in the return to school of more than half of this older group. "I don't think I would have had the incentive or courage to enroll in a regular university class" said one of those who had been away from school for thirty years. The others who had been contemplating a return to school seized on the special section: "As soon as I heard of the course I immediately requested it." The views of almost all of the other half were best expressed by one who said, "The course itself had no effect on my decision to begin college but I must say it certainly made that beginning much easier."[2]

All of the respondents in this group were warmly enthusiastic about how the section met their psychological, social, and motivational needs. One student, away from school for more than twenty-five years, spoke of gaining "reassurance" that she "was capable of university level work." Another in the same category said, "It was enlightening for me to know I could learn along with the younger generation." Three spoke variously of a "relaxed atmosphere," the elimination of age as "a factor in class discussions and during breaks," and of congeniality: "These students were much more friendly and open and able to share their experiences than were the students in the section from which I transferred." But the surest confirmation of my anticipation of the needs of non-traditional students came in responses to item seven (Explain, if you can, the ways in which this course bringing like students together served, or did not serve, your personal, psychological, motivational, social needs.), several of which I quote in their entirety. The quality of the experience is manifest in the students' eloquence:

> I experienced a feeling of belonging. It was the second university class I had taken (the first, a one week workshop the previous summer) and I was still rather overwhelmed by the whole university system. It was comforting to me to have other people in my age group with similar problems in my class. Now, after having experienced classes of primarily young people, I feel that the class for non-traditional students had more relevance for me.

> The course gave me a tremendous boost — the students in it had problems similar to mine — families, jobs, outside commitments, and we really offered support to each other. As I had had no previous college work, I was enrolled in freshman courses and this English course was one in which I established a rapport with the other students. I still see many of the students from that course as some lasting friendships were formed.

> I think this class bridged a gap for me by putting me with other students who had been away from studying. It helped me make the adjustment to being in classes with younger students, something I felt uneasy about. It was a way of meeting other non-traditional students which seems difficult to do otherwise. I find it extremely beneficial to talk over problems with other non-traditional students who are in the same situation.

> I really enjoyed the special section of English. It gave me confidence to continue with my education. I started out disbelieving that I was capable of doing adequate college work. Now, I know I won't quit until I have a degree.

Remarkably, there were few differences between the needs of the women who had been away from school for nine or fewer years and those of the much older students. It seems that even a one-year gap in the continuum of formal education was sufficient to intimidate a few people. In fact, one young woman just out of high school persuaded the registrar to let her enter the class (despite the fact that there were other evening classes for traditional students) because she was working full-time. Identifying herself as a non-traditional student, she argued: "Working full-time and taking night classes makes me feel. . . like an intruder who doesn't know what's going on around the campus." Afterward, she said the course served her need: "I felt more comfortable relating to people going through school the way I am and facing the same problems I am." Three other recent graduates appreciated the special section, though only one, four years removed from high school, claimed that the class played a part in the decision to return to school: "It made returning easier because I knew I'd have at least one class with older students." Only one student, who had returned after two years of deadly routine employment, felt that the course did *not* serve her at all: "When I registered for the course I had hoped that being in a class with other non-traditional students would mean that I could be more at ease and more comfortable than I would with a class of traditional students. I found out that I was not any more comfortable. . . there was very little difference between the English class and any of my other courses." She offered no explanation.

This group was evenly divided between the married and the unmarried and the career goals were not as well defined. Somewhat surprisingly, the urgency of their need for the supportive relationships of the special section was just as strong as that of the much older student for whom it might have been anticipated. Ease and reassurance are cited as values again and again. These women also seemed to delight in what they saw as livelier, more open, discussions:

> Up until the time I took this class I felt pretty isolated at the university: there were some non-traditional students in my other classes, but mainly men. In this class there were other mothers and wives like me and I didn't feel so alone. Furthermore, the class was stimulating because there was a lot of discussion. In some of the other classes the younger students didn't talk as much or argue or challenge the instructor. I feel this exchange is very important in the learning process.

> I felt more at ease with the other students than I did in my other classes. It seemed the common bonds were stronger. That fact made it easier to relate to others in conversations about personal experiences.

> I felt the class was interesting because many of the students talked about their personal experiences.

The degree to which even these younger women had acquired a sense of inadequacy or inferiority is evident in this explanation offered for item seven:

> The section proved to me that not only could I handle the work but also I was able to do well at it. It was a tremendous boost to my ego to get an "A" in the course. I thoroughly enjoyed matching wits with other non-traditional as well as traditional students.

This student, immediately upon completion of the first semester, earned exemption by examination from the subsequent required three-credit English course. It is noteworthy that six women from the four special sections earned exemption, a very large percentage as compared to the rest of the freshman class since ordinarily only one student in three sections gains exemption in this way.

Another student expressed increased self-esteem as a result of the participation in the class:

> The class alleviated my fears of being too old to go back to school. . . I developed a rather close friendship with two of my classmates who helped me through my first semester. The instructor understood the needs and problems of non-traditional students. The enthusiasm expressed by many of my classmates for education helped motivate me. Also, seeing the productive lives lead by some of my classmates prior to and during their college careers made me realize that, though a college education was desirable, if I didn't acquire it immediately, I could still be a productive person. (My not going to college immediately after high school had left me with a depressed feeling of worthlessness. Only through acquiring a college education did I feel that I would be "somebody".)

The goals of most of the women in the special sections did not change since their enrollment at the university. Most are continuing their education at the full- or part-time pace deemed necessary when they began. Some change of goals for personal or familial reasons was indicated by four students, all of whom felt it necessary to delay school to care for their young children. Not one respondent said she had decided against further university study. In fact two women responded that the enjoyment of learning was becoming a distinct goal.

> I'm not as concerned over a high paying job. The knowledge I've gained and the greater awareness of the world have already repaid me more than money could.

> My goals have changed. Though circumstances still dictate that I attend school on a part-time basis, I no longer feel the need to complete my education in a hurry but rather I want to enjoy the experience. I had set definite goals as to when my education would be completed and what my major and minor would be. Now I'm not so sure. After taking just five courses I find my interests are diverse and I want to allow myself to experience enough courses before I decide which way I'm going.

Only one enrollee identified herself as free of the need for any commitment — personal or economic — to degree work. The fact that she was the leisured seeker-of-experience for its own sake was not apparent until the survey. She said, "I usually sign for a course when I feel the need to prove to myself that my mind is still operative." Her delight was in meeting these students whose varied work experiences "broadened" her vision and helped her to "realize aspects of life other than" her own. Her conclusion reflects a sure sense of education's ultimate value: "This spring I watched 'The American Short Story' on public television with deeper pleasure and fond memories."

My experience in working with these four special sections has convinced me that if we are in earnest about our effort to recover the often nearly-lost intelligence, creativity and vitality of women deprived of a necessary education at the traditional age of eighteen, then we must provide a mode of re-entry into formal study that is as broadly supportive, compensatory, and individualized as we can make it. The evidence offered here suggests that there are women who both need and deserve that mode of re-entry and that the special section of freshman English offered by the English department at the University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point aided them in making that important transition.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 18

1. The survey questionnaire included the following items:

   (1) List the ways in which you feel you were a non-traditional student.

   (2) What special problems, if any, were attendant on your return to school?

   (3) What circumstances, forces, and/or persons made it possible for you to return to school?

   (4) What were your reasons for or goals in returning to academic work at the university?

   (5) What part — if any — did the existence of the English course for non-traditional students play in your decision to return? Explain.

   (6) How did you come to know about the availability of the course?

   (7) Explain, if you can, the ways in which this course bringing like students together served, or did not serve, your personal (psychological, motivational, social) needs.

   (8) Have your goals changed since your resumption of study? How? Explain. What were the causes of the change?

   In addition, the women were invited to offer other comments on related matters that the questions did not serve.

2. Of interest to readers who might want to provide a similar opportunity for non-traditional students is the fact that most of the students enrolling said that they first learned of the special section in the news story announcing it. Other sources were: faculty friends, university meetings for non-traditional students, and finally from the timetable or in counseling at registration.

19. Two Cases in Point

A Remarkable Woman: Grace Pilgrim Bloom (1886-1978)

by JoAnn Hinz

Grace Pilgrim Bloom was perhaps the most remarkable and widely publicized graduate of the University of Wisconsin-River Falls, receiving the degree Master of Science in teaching at age 86 in November, 1972. Some sixty years of experience had passed since she had been granted the degree Bachelor of Arts in history from UW-Madison in 1908.

Exhilarated in 1968 by a UW-River Falls extension course taught at Osceola, Wis., that explored tragedy in the theater, Bloom began pursuing her second degree.

The course work was simply a continuation of Bloom's life-long education, but attending classes was difficult. As well as commuting forty miles to River Falls from her home in Osceola, she often also required the aid of a wheelchair or walker to get about on campus. The octogenarian student was not hampered by a generation gap, however. As she told *St. Paul Pioneer Press* reporter Gareth Hiebert in 1971, "I love those moderns on campus, the boys and girls who go barefoot and wear jeans and long hair. They're so nice to me; open doors for me, help me, ask if I need anything. Why, they're the most thoughtful young people I've ever met. Gracious and delightful to be with."

Appreciation and respect for her is exemplified by the Grace Pilgrim Bloom English Resource Center at UW-River Falls. Here, she provided for a collection of instructional multi-media materials for use by students, faculty and area teachers.

During the time between her degrees, Grace Bloom taught school, married Swedish immigrant Olaf Bloom, and shared the editorship of two weekly newspapers with him. She became a competent historian, compiling a detailed genealogy of the Pilgrim family, a history of the Osceola area titled "Osceola: Yesterday and Today," and a book, *Fifty Years with a Country Editor*.

Bloom's vast knowledge of history and interest in its recording prompted an interview by the oral history laboratory of the area research center at UW-River Falls.[1]

Bloom discussed her four years at UW-Madison. She was probably one of the few students then living to have attended the classes of Frederick Jackson Turner and Carl Russell Fish.

She described Turner, her advisor, as modest, sedate and reserved and herself as timid in relation to him. She often paced the floor in the lobby of the Wisconsin State Historical Library before mustering courage to enter the document room, where Turner was available for counseling sessions.

After graduation she taught English in Mondovi, Wis., and history and English in Osceola. However, as was common at that time, Bloom's full-time teaching ended with her marriage in 1912. The school board president told her that her husband should support her, and that her position should be open to a single woman. Bloom was restricted to substituting until she returned to full-time teaching in the 1920s.

The Blooms became publishers and editors in 1937 when they purchased the *New Richmond Leader*, which was soon followed by the purchase of the *Osceola Sun* in 1942. Bloom did the writing and editing and her husband served as business manager. The newspapers openly expressed the liberal views of the Blooms, who were card-carrying members of the strongly supported Socialist Party in St. Croix County in the 1930s. Bloom once told reporters that the saddest day of her life was the day her husband came home and informed her that the Socialists had merged with LaFollette's Progressives. After that, she became a member of the Democratic Party.

Although the Blooms sold their newspapers in 1950, Mrs. Bloom's historical writings ran serially in the *Osceola Sun* for some time afterward.

Bloom's notable accomplishments were acknowledged nationally and internationally by educators. Job offers to teach came from a junior college in Joliet, Ill., and from Edge Hill College in Ormskirk, England. Failing eyesight and occasional hospitalization kept her from accepting.

Grace Pilgrim Bloom died at her home in Osceola, Wis., September 6, 1978, at the age of 92.

From Undergraduate to Judge at Sixty

by Betty D. Brown

Christine Webster of Neopit (and a member of the Menominee tribe) received her bachelor's degree in May of 1974, along with 200 other graduates at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay.

That's not unusual, unless you consider that Webster, at age sixty, was at that time (and still is) the oldest graduate in the brief history of UW-Green Bay. She is the mother of eleven children. She was also among the first ten UW-Green Bay students to have completed work in a personal concentration (major) and was the first person in Wisconsin to be certified by the state Department of Public Instruction to teach Native American languages.

It's a fair list of achievements, when you realize that she managed it along with the demands of a household, a part-time job and a 135-mile round trip to the campus two or three days a week for four years. The decision to enroll at UW-Green Bay took months to make. It began from a chance conversation with Harry Collins, a federal education counselor whose office was located in the Keshena Courthouse. Accompanying her son Schuyler to an interview about his educational future, Webster confided her own dream of a college degree. Urged on by Collins, she began to think seriously about the possibility and soon took the preliminary steps for mid-year enrollment. Her college career almost ended before it began on a blustery day in January, 1971. That was the day Webster drove to campus to complete her registration as a freshman. Her uncertainty about taking the step was by no means banished, and when her car refused to start that cold, windy day, she was almost ready to give up the idea completely.

"All those months I had been asking myself 'Can I do it? Can I study after all these years away from books?' And I wondered whether I was being fair to my family, although at that point, with my youngest child ten years old, I really didn't have so much to do at home," she says.

"When the car broke down, I figured that was it — a nice dream while it lasted. But Mr. Collins wouldn't listen to my excuses. He rounded up a couple of my friends — Gloria Peters and Helen Melotte, who were working for him at the time — and sent us off in another car. The first person we met in Green Bay was Jerry Olson, the admissions director. He was so kind and helpful, I decided it wasn't going to be so bad after all. So I registered, and started classes in February."

It was a rocky beginning at best, she remembers.

"I got very poor grades that first semester. After all those years, I had to find out how to study all over again, and to retain what I had heard and read. Learning how to take notes in class was the most difficult of all. And I had the problem of not really knowing the direction I wanted to take in my education.

"My family worried about me, too — but not about my ability to succeed academically. They feared for my safety on the long trip to the campus in all kinds of weather."

The worst of the weather came during the January interim term of 1972, when Webster traveled to the campus five days a week, battling blizzards and icy roads — and spending one night in a farmer's home when her car broke down. But it was during that same January that she made a decision about the focus of her future studies.

She recalls, "The course I was taking was called 'Red Man in White America.' It was a good course that dealt with the place of Indians in our culture and what it means to be an Indian. But I sat in that class growing more resentful every day — not in a personal way, not against the professor or my classmates — but resentful of the idea that I, an Indian, had to listen to a white man tell me about my own history.

"I decided then what I had to do: prepare myself to teach our own Menominee children — and adults, too, if possible — about ourselves, about our history, our culture and language."

She set about her task immediately, taking advantage of the opportunity open to students at UW-Green Bay to design a personal concentration rather than choosing one of the twelve interdisciplinary concentrations. With the help of Associate Professor Dennis Bryan of the education faculty, she planned the remaining three years of her academic program.

She also worked for two years in the university year for action program, first helping to organize and then teaching in the Keshena Community School. Many of the students in the school had previously dropped out of nearby public schools.

Bryan calls his experience with Webster "one of the biggest pleasures of my years at UW-Green Bay. I have watched her develop, watched her self-confidence grow.

"To me, she exemplifies all of the potential for achievement and leadership that we see from time to time in the returning adult student. And she is a living example of what a highly motivated person with well defined goals can achieve within the flexibility of our program."

As Webster received her diploma that Sunday afternoon, her husband and ten of her children watched with pride. In the years since, she has continued to win the admiration of her family, her friends and the entire Menominee community.

After graduating, Christine Webster returned to the classroom to teach upper elementary students in a federally-funded program of bilingual education, using materials on Menominee language and culture she had developed herself. Then in March of 1976, she received a federal appointment as one of three judges in the Menominee tribal court and a simultaneous appointment as juvenile court judge. Her time on the bench is now devoted almost exclusively to juvenile cases. In addition, she serves as a member of the advisory board for the Wisconsin juvenile justice personnel development center project.

In her new position, Christine Webster was on the road again — not only from home to work, but also to Denver, Colorado, to study law for three days out of every month, as required for all tribal judges, and to UW-Green Bay, where she enrolled in a master's degree program.

But the concern for Menominee youth that has guided Christine Webster's travels from the beginning continues to chart her course. The contribution she seeks to make to the young men and women she encounters — whether in the classroom or the courtroom — is best expressed in her own words:

"To encourage them to look at themselves positively instead of negatively. . . to help them realize that Native Americans have contributed much more to our country than dancing or beadwork. . . to point the way to discovery of a new sense of self worth and purpose for their lives."

NOTE TO CHAPTER 19

1 Dr. Walker Wyman, centennial distinguished professor of history, and Assistant Professor Zane Chaffee, department of English, both of the UW-River Falls faculty, conducted the interview in 1970.

CONTRIBUTORS

Bleier, Ruth: B.A., M.S.; Professor, Department of Neurophysiology, UW-Madison.

Brown, Betty D.: B.A.; Director of News Services and Publications, UW-Green Bay.

Clarenbach, Kathryn F.: B.A., M.A., Ph.D.; Professor of Political Science, Unit Head of Women's Education Resources, UW-Extension, Madison.

Crisler, Jane E.: B.A., M.A.; Director of University Special Student Office, UW-Milwaukee.

Freeman, Bonnie Cook: B.A., M.A., Ph.D.; Assistant Professor, College of Education, University of Texas, Austin.

Geisler, Margaret P.: B.A., M.S.; Associate Director of Continuing Education Programs, UW-Madison.

Guskin, Judith T.: Ph.D.; Adjunct Associate Professor of Anthropology, Behavioral Science Division, UW-Parkside.

Hicklin, Fannie E.: B.A., M.A., Ph.D.; Associate Dean of Faculties, UW-Whitewater.

Hinz, JoAnn: B.S.; Director, University News Bureau, UW-River Falls.

Kiefer, Irene Golden: A.B.; Assistant Director of News Services, UW-Green Bay.

Krouse, Agate Nesaule: B.A., M.A., Ph.D.; Professor, Department of English and Coordinator of Women's Studies, UW-Whitewater.

Krouse, Harry: B.A., M.A., Ph.D.; Professor and Chair, Department of English, UW-Whitewater.

Macaulay, Jacqueline: Ph.D.; Madison, WI.

Merritt, Karen: B.A., M.A., Ph.D.; Academic Planner for Arts and Humanities, Office of Academic Affairs, University of Wisconsin System.

Moore, Nancy Newell: B.A., M.A., Ph.D.; Professor, Department of English, UW-Stevens Point.

Parsons, Barbara: A.B., M.A., Ph.D.; Professor, Department of Philosophy, UW-Platteville.

Saunders, Kit: B.A., M.S., Ph.D.; Director of Women's Intercollegiate Athletics, UW-Madison.

Skalitzky, Rachel I.: B.A., M.A., Ph.D.; Associate Professor, Department of Comparative Literature and Women's Studies Coordinator, UW-Milwaukee.

Stelmahoske, Isabelle: B.S., M.A.; Assistant Professor, Department of English, UW-Stevens Point.

Sylvander, Carolyn Wedin: B.A., M.A., Ph.D.; Associate Professor, Department of English, UW-Whitewater.

Van Dyk, Jane Moriarty: B.A., Ph.D.; Director of Institutional Research and Title III Coordinator, Eastern Montana College.